AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. V.—(XV.)—SEPTEMBER, 1896.—NO. 3.

MISSAL OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S ABBEY, CANTERBURY.

EIGHT centuries, almost to a year, after the last transcription, and thirteen hundred years, almost to a week, after its departure, in a more archaic form, for the heathen and barbaric shores of Britain, a freshly-made copy of the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, has been returned to the Eternal City whence it originally came, reproduced in manifold iteration under conditions of manufacture, mechanism and steam-power unknown alike to both Rome and England of the past. Mr. Martin Rule is the happy man who, seconded by the authorities of the press of an ancient University, is the efficient, if not the final, cause of the strange and singular coincidence which stands as the exordium of this brief summary. He claims to have discovered in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, England, an immediate transcript from one of the Mass-Books which St. Gregory the Great entrusted to his missionary monk, Augustine, for the use of the future "Church of the English." If his claim be a just one, Mr. Rule will have enjoyed the signal honour of laying at the feet of the illustrious and learned successor of St. Gregory an accurate reproduction of a most venerable and interesting document. Its pristine text had, of course, been augmented by additions silently and slowly

[The Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, England, edited from the MS. at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, by Martin Rule, M.A., Cambridge: University Press. 1896. Royal 8vo, pp. clxxxiv, and 174.]

deposited during the five centuries which elapsed between its being sent from Rome in the closing years of the sixth century, and its transcription in the Monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul at Canterbury. But the actual transcript, to the eye of a trained liturgiologist, enshrines in evidently recognizable form and characteristics, and as its nucleus or germ, the very document which left the official Scriptorium of the saintly Pontiff in the year 596. It is the manifest recognizability of the embodied original, as distinguished from adventitious accretions, which constitutes one of the several claims on the interest of theologians and scholars preferred by the santaugustinian missal now handsomely and suitably reproduced by means of the printing press, and through the untiring industry and patience of Mr. Rule, from a manuscript executed in or about the year of grace 1099.

A simple record of this result of the thought and labor of years may be made in the following terms: Mr. Martin Rule, a convert to the faith of seven and twenty years, is one of many Anglican clergymen of University education who have submitted to the Church during the last half century. Soon after his conversion—unlike some who were powerless to utilize their talents when life had been cut in half by their submission—he either began or continued a career to which he felt himself called, that of pure literature. Some of his efforts may be named. He edited for the Master of the Rolls in London one of the series of National Records which for many years past have been published at the cost of the British Government, Eadmer's "Historia Novorum;" and he is the author of an able and exhaustive work on the "Life and Times of St. Anselm," Archbishop of Canterbury. These publications were preceded by a controversial essay on the practical conduct of the Church of England in respect to the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, and were followed by a monograph on the bibliographical methods of Eadmer and the searching light shed by them on the relations and literary rivalries of Eadmer and William of Malmesbury. The last-named essay, like much of Mr. Rule's introduction to the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, is traced on stichometrical

lines, and, like it, was printed at the University Press. It forms part of the Transactions of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society for the year 1886. These four works are a more than sufficient, they are an honorable and praiseworthy record of the use to which Mr. Rule has devoted the Catholic years of his life. We trust that Mr. Rule's record will not halt at this point, for the works of his hero and saint, the learned and pious Archbishop Anselm, cry aloud for a complete and critical edition. Such editions of such saints and doctors are at the present day, so to say, in the air; and perhaps few scholars are more familiar with a large part of St. Anselm's theological works, not to speak of his Letters and of the story of his life-long confessorship for the faith, than Mr. Rule. However this may be in the future, we have now to deal with the past. In the past, then, and whilst the editor of Eadmer's Chronicle was engaged on his legitimate work, there came to him in regard to the history of the Missal of St. Augustine's, a literary inspiration. The details of this inspiration may be read in the Introduction to the Missal; and they will repay the trouble of reference. Suffice it to say here that a single word of English use, written by nobody knows who, somewhat contemptuously criticised by Lanfranc, and found imbedded in the language of a Missal of the Church of the English by Mr. Rule, led that author to a casual, next to a careful, and lastly to a scholarlike and scientific examination of the manuscript which contained the provincialism. Once seriously taken in hand, albeit presented by pure accident from a human point of view, the examination of this curious solecism led to the deliberate study of the work containing it; nor did Mr. Rule relax his grasp upon the document—figuratively, almost physically—until he had wrung from its folios the secret of its parentage, of its birth, and of its history.

It is a long and intricate story, is that of the Missal of St. Augustine's, and of its discovery, study, authentication. But it admits of being epitomized. After consultation with certain chief literary authorities of the day in his University,

seven years ago; after verbal and literal collation of the manuscript with all known editions in print of St. Gregory's Sacramentary, and a comparison and contrast of its Latinity with the style and manner of certain acknowledged works of Gregory the Great, whether moral, dogmatic or ascetic; and, last in order of narration, but first in order of time, after the labor of copying with his own hand in the library of Corpus Christi College, not only with a view to a mastery of its contents, but also to possible publication, every leaf, line and letter of the precious find, Mr. Rule arrived at a decided opinion, and expressed that opinion in definite terms on the origin, the first inception, the subsequent modification, the final issue of the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey. That judgment has been indicated above, and it is based upon learned and scholarlike grounds. It conveys no shadow of depreciation to admit that accident, not design, lay at the foundation in the first instance of the discovery; rather, the reverse is true. It is not given to every student to possess or to exercise the power of looking behind and beyond and beneath an accident. The Missal, indeed, was not outwardly unknown to a small and limited circle of English scholars, who all and equally failed to suspect the history, and estimate the real worth of the treasure which they, after handling and superficially examining, had consigned to its immemorial dust and solitude. Mr. Rule, on the contrary, with the instinct of a discoverer, the learning of a professor, the imagination of an enthusiast and the patience of a devotee, obtained a clue to something he knew not what, followed it he knew not whither, and found what was destined to be eventually his exceeding great liturgical reward. His literary instinct, together with its immediate results, led to a long series of strange and unwonted discoveries in the same department of letters, which though they may appear to be due to good fortune, were in truth, one and all, the fruit of the labor of a student obtaining from his studies results large in proportion to the richness of the gifts and endowments which he independently brought to bear upon them. His is only a late instance of the truth of the inspired aphorism and

promise applied to sacred criticism, that to him that hath shall be given. Mr. Rule began his ritual quest after the unknown and unexpected, enriched with a mental and intellectual equipment which ensured his achievement, in liturgical science and in Missal literature, of the inevitable and the certain.

These preliminary remarks may fittingly be followed by a summary account of what Mr. Rule claims to have discovered. It is certain that St. Gregory the Great furnished his missionary priests with copies of the sacred books wherewith to offer the Holy Sacrifice in a far-off land. These sacred books, received from the hand of the great Pontiff, were, in all likelihood, revised and corrected at the Papal Scriptorium in Rome, and at the last moment before departure and from the latest edition—to use modern language—of the standard exemplar, or authorized copy, of the Holy Father's own Sacramentary; and it is an unquestioned and unquestionable fact that they, or some of them, were seen and touched, and compared with certain other Missals, about two centuries later, by Egbert, Archbishop of York. This examination was made—at least, in Mr. Rule's view—in the proper and legitimate home of the Missal, which was not, as has been supposed, the Cathedral Church of Canterbury, but rather, the original abode and centre of the mission, the Monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul outside the walls of the city: and some of the results of this examination were ritually annotated by the Archbishop, his criticism being extant to the present day. Between the year of the transmission of the Missals for the use of the Church of the English, in 596, and the date of the transcription of one of them in 1099, these manuscripts would seem to have undergone no material alteration or change, although numerous additions were inevitably made to them. Of their history between the eleventh and the sixteenth centuries we are ignorant; but in the reign of Queen Elizabeth the document now edited by Mr. Rule passed by some unknown means into the keeping of the schismatical but learned Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Matthew Parker, who be-

queathed it, with other valuable books, to the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. There it has reposed in undisturbed seclusion and in unmerited neglect for three centuries, until by the irony of fate it has been laid open to the light, not by the acumen and diligence of one of Archbishop Parker's co-religionists, but by a sharer in one and the same faith with the Pontiff who dispatched the parent document from Rome. And now, in these latter days, re-discovered or disinterred; authenticated as to its origin, and dated as to its final scription; copied laboriously by a loving hand and reproduced with careful fidelity as well as with typographical luxuriance; published by the press of the University where it has long found a shelter and distributed over the world of letters, the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey is confidently declared to embody, as to all but the whole of its Temporale, and the most ancient masses of its Sanctorale,[1] a recension hitherto unknown to scholars and liturgists, a recension of later date than those which were accepted as the basis of the Tridentine edition of the Roman Missal; and yet, withal, a recension of the great Pope's own Mass Book due to the hand and the pen of St. Gregory himself.

Thus, much may be said of the external story of the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey. Its inner characteristics and structure hardly bear a condensed summary, and will scarcely submit to be epitomized. Yet, an abstract must be attempted if justice is to be done to this side of the composite question of authenticity. In addition to the external evidence which Mr. Rule has evolved, collected and catalogued, and supplementary to the conclusions to which he was thereby irresistibly drawn, a long complicated train of internal proofs became obvious to the editor's mind, and have been detailed at great length, perhaps at too great a length for that indescribable entity, the general reader, though at a length to instruct, as well as interest the liturgical scholar. These subjective intimations tend, all of

1 With, however, one solitary exception of great interest. We hope to notice this in the sequel.

them, directly or indirectly, to a conclusion which it is impossible logically to avoid, viz., the authentic Gregorian origination of the irreducible minimum of the manuscript under consideration. As we have just intimated, they will be found, scientifically arranged, in the pages of Mr. Rule's Introduction. This first conclusion is followed by another, to the effect that the manuscript now edited is an immediate, not a secondary or remote derivative from one of the Mass Books sent by Pope St. Gregory the Great to England; and the second conclusion is supplemented by yet a third, that the particular Mass Book thus transcribed was nothing less than St. Gregory's own working copy of the Sacramentary known by his name.

An effort will now be made to realize in general terms how and by what steps Mr. Rule reached the conclusions at which, rightly or wrongly, he has arrived. The effort will be made under conditions which fall short of being those of a principal in the transaction. Rather, it will be the effort to place both reader and writer in the position of followers on the track of an explorer, of those who would note the arguments and weigh the conclusions of a liturgical expert who has made the discovery which he claims to have made. This position may be reached by three graduated steps which lead to three different levels whence, respectively, a bird's-eye view may be taken, whence the middle-distance may be contemplated, and whence an introspective diagnosis may be obtained of the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury. We must first see with a disciple's eye what actually met the expert's sense of vision; indeed, what will meet the vision of any one, however unscientific may be his experimental knowledge of liturgies, when he handles the precious document. Then, we must note what an ordinary student and scholar of missals may perceive from a somewhat more careful investigation of a certainly ancient and presumably valuable codex. Finally, we must endeavor to ascertain what may be the actual extent of the discovery from other manuscripts claiming a like origination, and with what intellectual convictions, after years of explanation and

thought, the Editor of the Missal regards his discovery. On the present occasion, we shall mainly confine our attention to the first two of these considerations, as being the less critical. A more critical estimate may be relegated to a future inquiry.

The first named experience, of course, can be gained by any one who is content to make a pilgrimage to the discoverer's *Alma Mater*, the University of Cambridge, England, and therein to the Library of Corpus Christi College. But this form of visual evidence is not attainable by all readers of these pages, may not be convenient to many, will probably be the lot of few; and hence, even second or third hand testimony, under this heading, may alone perhaps be secured by the majority of readers. The second experience, however, may be obtained, from the printed volume before us, by any one who possesses a certain amount of liturgical knowledge, who takes the trouble to exercise his mental faculties, and who is gifted with sufficient power of imagination. The third and last experience, from the nature of the case, stands apart from the other two, demands more from both writer and reader, and requires wider space for its elucidation. Let us strive to place on record some obvious features, or features not recondite, more or less exact or vague, which strike an average inquirer when he makes inquiry into the first two forms of objective estimate, the general and the particular. This course will leave the ground free for consideration, more closely and at length, of the third and more critical estimate, which, adding elements to either, combines both the introspective and subjective view of the document under notice.

I.—An average person who for the first time may have heard of the alleged discovery in the nineteenth century of a copy of one of the Mass-Books which were brought to England with the Mission of St. Augustine of Canterbury, in the sixth century, would form some mental picture of the manuscript based upon experience. Probably, the following would represent no very imperfect reflection of his picture. He would conceive, however much time and honest use, or

however much accident or usage not altogether honest, may have altered the outward appearance of the Altar-Book, that it would bear not only a family likeness, but even a close resemblance in detail to the Roman Missal of the present day. There would be found, of course, he would argue, the central and sacredest portion of the Mass, the Canon, in its integrity. There would be seen the various constituent parts of secondary, but still of high importance, such as the Collects, the Secret Prayers, and the prayers said after the Communion of the priest. There might not perhaps be read Epistle and Gospel written at length for all the year round; but there might exist in a complete, if archaic form, the introductory portion of the sacred function in its more developed period, with its proper Introit—antiphon, psalm and gloria—the Offertory, and the usual ending of the Mass, Benediction and Last Gospel. And also, there might possibly be found—considering the assigned date of the MS., and ignoring for the moment the accepted date of the introduction of sequences—sacred verse from Prudentius or Sedulius, or, remembering the missionary Augustine's spiritual chief, a hymn of St. Gregory, or one from the pen of St. Ambrose. Whether these integral and secondary elements would be encased within wooden boards covered with historical pig-skin, so closely and tightly fastened together that the volume opened with difficulty, and the leaves remained open not at all without artificial aid, the inquirer would have no antecedent opinion. But, he would probably hold that the volume in its final form contained a large illuminated page of the crucifixion; he would be fairly assured of consulting a calendar with, perhaps, forgotten saints' names, or unusual commemorations; and he would confidently expect to find that the priest was directed in various parts of the Missal if not how to vest himself and place himself, at least how to say or sing his Mass, if it were only, as in other manuscripts of the same, or perhaps of earlier date, by short, laconic, and even mono-verbal instructions.

In the larger part of his sanguine expectations the average

person has probably formed an imperfect and distorted conception of the real Missal used by St. Augustine of Canterbury. He will, if he find it at all, find the Canon, indeed, but not under the form which he had pictured to himself. He will not find the text of the lections from the Gospels and Epistles which he may know by heart; nor will he always or often find, save in the later portions, even references or catch-words indicative of either Epistle or Gospel, for days or for seasons ecclesiastical. He will light upon no calendar of any sort or kind, common or curious, for the calendar of the Missal of St. Augustine's has disappeared, probably centuries ago; nor will his hymnological sense be gladdened by an unknown verse of St. Gregory; or his sense of liturgical propriety quickened by a rubric written thirteen centuries ago. No; speaking in general terms, and confining attention at present to the older, if not to the oldest, portions of the document, the suppositious inquirer will find only the two following main, all-important, but very different constituent parts of the Mass of the early Church of the English. In the first place we have the invariable and indispensable Canon, immediately touched, on either side, by the masses for the penitential seasons of Lent and those of the queen of festivals, the Resurrection. The second constituent element is a prolonged series of three short and variable prayers for Mass, arranged in three categories, one of which follows the ecclesiastical cycle of the year, and another the civil cycle, whilst the third comprises votive masses. This triple series, it is needless to add, is made up, severally, of the Oratio, the index or key-note of the Mass of the day, now termed the Collect, of the Secret prayer, and of the Post-communion; (1) for most of the Sundays and weekdays, for the major holydays and seasons of the Church; (2) for such saints' days and other feasts as were commemorated in the time of St. Augustine; and (3) for occasional celebrations. In addition to these two more ancient portions of the Mass, the fixed and the variable, there stands at the beginning of the volume a collection of devotional forms, including the Gloria in Excelsis and a part of the Credo. Now, the whole of these manifold

liturgical details, be they variable or invariable; be they of earlier or of later composition; be they elements of prayer, praise or worship; be they the record of action done or of saints remembered, or of mysteries enunciated—all are entirely innocent of directive ritual and ceremonial adjuncts. There are, it is true, what the Editor terms "Minor rubrics," that is to say, merely verbal titles and headings to the prayers; but there is not in the Missal of St. Augustine's a single verbal direction[1] touching the vestments of the priest, his posture, movements or gestures, nothing even to regulate his manual acts at the altar during the recitation of the Canon. What is done now and to-day by the Catholic priesthood in virtue of a definite law of written obligation, was done in the time of St. Augustine by an even stricter law of verbal tradition, as in a still more remote antiquity what was said at the altar—the very words of the Canon—had been handed down, word by word, how we know not, or for how long we know not, or by what instrumentality, saving by the direction of the Holy Ghost, we know not, as a most sacred deposit of faith, by spiritual father to spiritual child, in oral teaching from the first age of the Church.

II.—Such is the aspect of the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey at Canterbury which, upon a cursory and superficial inspection of the volume, presents itself to an average inquirer. But a student of liturgiology, or even a scholar with only a partial knowledge of the science, will perceive more. Further examination will widen and deepen his appreciation of the document, will excite his interest, will stimulate his efforts to realise with greater definiteness and

1 We say "verbal direction;" for the Canon has its full complement of manual crosses. Curiously enough, however, Mr. Rule believes the Canon to have been copied into the Corpus MS. from some alien source and corrected subsequently into conformity with the text of one of the missals brought to Canterbury by St. Augustine. In his opinion, the particular book which served as exemplar to the scribe of the Corpus MS. did not contain the Canon. He believes that it was, strictly speaking, not a missal but a sacramentary; and further, that until St. Gregory should cease to use it as a working-copy the insertion of the Canon would have been inopportune.

exactitude its contents, date and history. And the results obtainable from a search through the volume, by a somewhat more competent and scientific inquirer, may next be adventured. After a careful turning of the leaves from end to end, the liturgical eye will pronounce the manuscript to be a document of high antiquity and of a composite and varied character, whether reference be made to its verbal, constituent, or structural features, or to the several ages or dates of them, or to their possible origin, or to their assured authorship. The Missal contains numerous components which, as is clear both from internal evidence and from external history, did not come, and could not have come, from either the head or the heart of St. Gregory. On the other hand, long and continuous portions of the Missal are built upon a solid and wide substratum or foundation of liturgical materials which—if they be not, as probably many of them are, of earlier composition than the life time of the founder of the Church of the English—clearly came, and could have come, from no other source than from the affections and brain of the supreme Pontiff himself. But, when these have been duly noted a residuum of masses yet remains, almost every one of which is characterized by diverse and complex peculiarities which it is by no means easy to master, still less methodically to summarise when grasped, though it be not difficult to describe the darkness which hangs over this division of the subject, the pitfalls which surround it, the doubts which interpenetrate it, and the liturgical danger involved in any crude, or unscientific attempt to disperse the first named, or to solve the others.

It is this third category of masses in which, viewed mentally, not outwardly, lie the scene and site of one of the discoveries which Mr. Martin Rule claims to have made ; or rather, in it is contained the noteworthy collection of materials out of which he forges one of his most intricate chains of ratiocination. In this category are found liturgical ingredients of origin hitherto unsuspected and of date hitherto unquestioned. It comprises—we speak in general and modern terms, and in view of the standard text of the Roman Mis-

sal—additions, corrections, and amendments. It is characterised by omissions, by erasures, and by what may be called the re-scriptions which create palimpsests. It is scriptorially disfigured, though ritually enriched, by textual hieroglyphics, by pencilled memoranda, by marginal and interlinear notes; by hints, suggestions, and afterthoughts. These deflections from the text enshrined in both more modern and more ancient Sacramentaries, deflections sometimes slight, but never insignificant, constitute one, but only one, of the characteristics which differentiate the Missal of St. Augustine's from all other known kindred manuscripts. To the authorship, the dates, the details, the story of these items of differentiation, both severally and in combination, and of whatever kind, Mr. Martin Rule has directed his attention and study for a certain measurable fraction of his life as a Catholic. At the least, and indisputably, he is the first and hitherto the sole student of the document who has so much as allowed himself to hold, or at least to enunciate, any theory at all, or who has ventured publicly to propound any but the merest superficialities, touching the extremely valuable work which he has now laid bare to the liturgical world. We will, therefore, endeavor to state an outline of his case, so far as may be possible in his own words, descriptively; to follow his cautious, but bold leading, so far as it may be possible to mark and tread in his footsteps; and tentatively, not absolutely, to determine whether or not the probabilities are that Mr. Rule's contention is true and his discovery genuine; or whether, whilst admiring his patient toil and learned argumentation, we must pronounce him to be wanting in critical acumen, in liturgic judgment, in historical knowledge, and in philosophical power. For, no third position can be maintained, or is possible. The Missal of St. Augustine's either contains in its earliest form and its original germ, as a development of the Sacramentary of St. Gelasius—of course with many elements of change—the editorial revision of his own work, from the lips, if not from the hand of St. Gregory the Great, or Mr. Rule is the victim of a generous, but enthusiastic mistake. And this leads us to the third point above-

named, on which a few words may be ventured introductory to a more critical estimate in the future.

III.—A clear and consecutive statement of the history of Mr. Rule's work upon the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, and its results, can only be essayed with difficulty and elaborated with doubt. Moreover, under the present conditions, and in this place, it can only be attempted partially; for, to describe and annotate the work as a whole, or to elucidate even a tithe of its contents, would render necessary a review of still greater bulk than even Mr. Rule's lengthy introduction to his volume. And to this comprehensive introduction the reader is once more and plenarily referred, in order that obvious and unavoidable gaps in the interpretation of it may be adequately supplied. But, even in his prolonged introduction the author himself cannot tell us all, or nearly all, that he saw and thought and felt and did in regard to his discovery. Whilst he indicates lines of thought and stepping-stones in argument, he cannot supply the reader with expert knowledge, or with the devotion of a decade of years' consideration, by which the one may be scientifically followed and the other may be logically connected. Though himself possessed in a high degree of liturgic instinct and imagination, developed, if not in part created by continuous study and reflection, he must of necessity leave much to be accepted on trust by a follower who may be conscious of his own want of ritual knowledge. Hence, it is no figure of speech to say that Mr. Rule writes for scholars; and that his learned labors, in many departments of scholarship, demand for their compensation, if not for their acceptance, and still more for their subjection to intelligent criticism, a certain amount of independent knowledge.

It will be well here to indicate the different ways in which the editor considers the volume under review, and the distinct methods by which he seeks to test and appraise its contents. Mr. Rule has worked upon his many-sided subject by at the least four different methods, which, unless the enunciation of them has escaped notice, he has omitted categorically to name; and by a process which appears to be

exhaustive, he has selected three aspects under which to view his attested discoveries in the Missal of St. Augustine's; and these three ways he has not only stated, but explained as follows: At the opening of his introduction, Mr. Rule thus declares and defines the categories under which the subject-matter of his analysis may be regarded. "I use the term *verbal text*, he says, as a convenient phrase for the several words of which a prayer, or other liturgical composition, is made up. I use *constituent text*, for the several prayers, or other components of a Mass. And I use the words *structural text*, to indicate the several Masses, thus constituted, which are included in the volume, in respect of their number, their order, and their external characteristics." As to his four methods of examination, methods which, even if unindicated, have left their impress on the editor's exhibition of the outcome of his diagnosis, they are these: 1. The verbal or grammatical method; 2. The liturgical method; 3. The historical and antiquarian method; and 4. The method of stichometry. Now, of these four methods by which Mr. Rule seeks to unfold his theory of the date, development and story of the Missal of St. Augustine's, the stichometrical is one which stands apart from the other three. As applied to manuscripts at the present day, it is comparatively a new science, to such a degree, indeed, that the very term, in its practical sense, of course, not in its liturgical meaning, appears to be somewhat widely unfamiliar to those "whose talk is of" libraries and books. Applied to Missal literature, this department of the paleographic art is almost entirely new in practice, though, like many so-called novelties in physics and metaphysics, it is a system old to the extent of some three and twenty centuries, revived, re-stated, and re-furbished anew to-day. And if Mr. Rule be not the first who has utilised this branch of the art to the determination of critical questions of origin and authorship, he is certainly the first who has succeeded so widely in the results he has attained. Indeed, the employment of the system by Mr. Rule has produced such unexpected, and even picturesque results, that to condense them to dimensions in keeping with

the limits of a review would be to spoil their effect, with no counterbalancing advantage. For its due statement and application to the present instance of use, the stichometrical method would demand not a part of an article, but the entirety. Hence, this method of inquiry and argument will, as a method, be comparatively neglected. Neither will it be possible to do more than offer fragmentary and independent items of suggestions or proof on behalf of Mr. Rule's several contentions in regard to the other three of his methods of work. His range of thought and area of inquiry, in the grammatical, historical and liturgical methods of argument, are too wide for actual repetition. One instance from a single method, which is by no means a solitary or extreme instance of a like kind in this or other fields, may suffice to justify such partial treatment in a review. It has regard to that element of his four-fold method which is concerned with the verbal and phraseological variations between the *santaugustinian* text of the Missal and other cognate texts, or with questions involving comparison, in respect of authorial style, manner, mannerism or diction, between the same text and the acknowledged writings of the creator of the Gregorian Mass-book in its earlier and undisputed editions. When it is learnt that, in order to establish a single certain contention in literary criticism, touching St. Gregory's alleged authorship of sundry verbal variations in the text, the editor made it his business to read, amongst other voluminous remains of the Saint, a work of more than two thousand octavo pages in length—*viz.*, the Pope's "Morals on the Book of Job"—some idea of the thoroughness of his critical work may be obtained, as well as of the impossibility of a reviewer's opportunity, under existing conditions, to follow him step by step. But, of course, as Mr. Rule relies, for the acceptance of his thesis, upon arguments drawn from all four critical methods, none of them can be ignored by one who would faithfully indicate Mr. Rule's position.

We are now comparatively free to attempt to consider some of the more important phases of thought through which Mr. Rule passed, and to estimate some salient features in the

arguments which appealed most forcibly to Mr. Rule's intelligence, before he reached, and in consequence of which he reached, the goal where argument in favor of the Gregorian origin of the germ or norm of the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey resolved itself into certitude. This attempt must be made, with the consent of the editor of the AMERICAN ECCLESTICAL REVIEW, on another occasion.

AN ENGLISH CATHOLIC.

SUSPENSION "EX INFORMATA CONSCIENTIA."

ARTICLE III.

Second condition—the crime must be *occult.* Difficulties of interpretation. Bouix holds that public crimes may be punished *ex informata*—argues from the text "etiam ob occultum crimen" of the Council of Trent. Examples, cited by Strember, of public crimes which may be considered *occult* on account of extrinsic circumstances. Theory of Santi, Pierantonelli, Cavagnis—supported by the Holy See.

Cases which may be treated judicially are not subject matter for suspension "ex informata." Dr. Smith's view regarding this interpretation of the Decree "Cum honestius." Does the Instruction of 1884 favor his view? The decision of the Congr. of Bishops and Regulars adverse to the theory. Practical suggestion.

Third condition—grave matter. Is the Bishop obliged to tell the priest why he suspends him? Not necessarily. The Bishop may not take any one else into his confidence. Example of the formula "ex informata conscientia." What remedy has a priest suspended under such circumstances? Final consideration regarding the use of this censure by the Bishop.

THE knowledge of a cleric's guilt is not sufficient justification to proceed "ex informata conscientia." The text of the Council requires first, that the crime should be occult; secondly, that it be sufficiently serious to warrant a punishment of such a nature.

Let us examine the first of these conditions. Much has been written about this point, and it is here that we find the very kernel of the whole difficulty. To incur a suspension there must be a fault, and a grave fault; but what is meant by an *occult* fault? Much discussion and a close study of the text of the law, coupled with a searching investigation into the aims and purposes of the Tridentine Fathers, has led canonists generally to a nearly unanimous interpretation of the term *occult.* However, an "Instructio" of the Congregation, under date October 20, 1884, gave occasion to new doubts, and seemed to favor Dr. Smith's close and rigorous interpretation of the word *occult.* We shall try and find out if the American canonist is to be followed and sustained in his opinion, which is at variance with that of Bouix, Cavagnis, Pierantonelli, etc. We may be compelled to treat the matter at greater length than we intended, but we must follow and weigh the arguments advanced by these authors individually.

The principle that public faults should at any time become the direct object of this censure is hardly tenable. To do so would be to run counter to the clearly determined scope of the Council, to neglect the authoritative interpretations furnished by numerous decisions of the Roman Congregations. Moreover, it seems ureasonable to make public offences the object of secret censure, as though authority intended to connive at the crimes by shielding the culprit.[1] To admit that public crimes are ordinarily punishable by suspension *ex informata*, would be to undermine the whole judicial and dis-

1 Cf. *Praelectiones S. Sulp.* loc. cit. (a) Modus ille procedendi concessus est ad providendum necessitatibus Ecclesiarum, nec expedit ut adhibeatur praeter casus necessitatis . . . alioquin exosa redderetur auctoritas praesulum, et recederetur á mente Concilii Tridentini. (b) S. Congregatio cujus auctoritate praesertim innitimur in interpretatione Concilii Tridentini innuit variis decisionibus quae apud canonistas leguntur, hujusmodi sententias non ferri ob delictum publicum . . . (c) Tandem, praecipua ratio cum Concilium induxit modum á jure communi exorbitantem est necessitas avertendi scandalum, et dandi medium sufficiens amovendi á sacris functionibus clericum indignum quando nimium difficilis foret informatio juridica: si veró delictum sit publidum, non est communiter ratio procedendi extrajudicialiter.

ciplinary system of the Church. It would take away the possibility of an appeal and render entire chapters of the Council of Trent utterly meaningless.

Contrary to the trend of Roman decisions, and despite the arguments of canonists, Bouix affirms the opposite opinion.[1] He defends his assumed position on the strength of the word *etiam*, the Council permitting the bishop to proceed extra-judicially *etiam ob crimen occultum.* It is needless to enter here into the full development of his theory, which has, indeed, many excellent points, but which is so sweeping and absolute as to overreach itself and lessen its merit. It is certain that there may be crimes of public notoriety which escape the bishop's executive authority if he were to confine himself to the ordinary methods of procedure. Take for instance the case cited by Stremler.[2] "When the crime is known by but two or three witnesses and its wider publication would result in a scandal ; or when witnesses decline to answer the summons and testify ; or again, when the defendant, either by his personal influence or by threats were to succeed in frightening the witnesses and the judge, or if defendant could impede in any way the regular course of the trial, bribing, false testimonies, etc. . . . for in such cases he would either delay or diminish the penalty which both justice and the edification of the christian people demand to be immediate and exemplary." But a crime of this nature is, I contend, not a public crime ; since it belongs rather, as Santi maintains, to the class of faults which are in their nature *occult* delinquencies, for they cannot admittedly be made public in such a way as either to establish their

1 Cf. *op cit.* t. II, cap. III, p. 325 : "Positae conclusioni adversari vigentem hodie apud romanos canonistas persuasionem, mihi Romae degenti aperte innotuit. Ipsi nempe existimant. non posse episcopum ex informatâ conscientiâ procedere quando delictum est fama vulgatum, sed necessarió tunc adhibendam judicii formam. Cumque nonnullis eorum patefecerim mihi esse in proposito contrariam sententiam tueri, atciter obstitēre, et ne ut probabilem quidem harnc meam opinionem admiserunt ;utpote quae ipsis, á sensu et mente Tridentinorum, circa sententias ex informatâ conscientiâ decretorum aperte aberrasse videretur."

2 *Des Peines Ecclésiastiques*, p. 316.

existence or to stamp them out altogether. It may be objected that this is a new interpretation of the word *occult*, but if we are guided by the spirit and intention of the Council, we must accept this meaning as justified. The late regent of the Poenitentiaria gave the following definition of the word occult, which implies a two-fold sense. "Occultum crimen," says he, "est:

1° Illud quod in foro externo nec probari nec condemnari potest.

2°. Illud, quod, *licet legitimis probationibus possit demonstrari*, tamen id fieri non posset absque fidelium scandalo, et majori ipsius cleri delinquentis detrimento."[1]

Unfortunately there are cases when human malice is a bar to a legal conviction and to canonical punishment before an ecclesiastical tribunal, even for crimes of a public character. Agai. , there are circumstances when the enforcement of the penalty openly and in strict judicial form would produce incalculable mischief among the faithful, and ruin forever the reputation and consequently the usefulness of an ecclesiastic. In such cases the crime though public in the usual sense of the word, becomes, owing to its peculiar environments, of a private character. This is in no way subversive of the general theory, and Santi is ready to admit that the Council is open to such an interpretation. Indeed it seems to us more reasonable than the opinion arrived at by Icard[2] and Bouix, who insist upon the force of the term "ex quacumque causa etiam ob occultum crimen." Bishop Messmer[3] does not think that the particle "etiam" is susceptible of the meaning given it by the two French canonists. "The particle 'etiam' in occultis," says he, "has not an extensive but a restrictive meaning, something like scilicet (namely)."[4] He admits that in the hypothesis presented above there is every liberty given to proceed "ex informatâ conscientiâ" if a regular trial is made impossible or inconvenient owing to the contu-

1. *SANTI, Paelectiones*, tit. I, "De accusationibus," lib. V, Decret. n. 18.

2. *Opus cit.* III p. 108

3. *Canonical Procedure*, sect. II, art. III, n. 94, p. 158.

4. Cf. *Analecta Juris Pont.* XIX 1228.

macy of the witnesses or the fear of a public scandal arising from a grave crime.[1] The best way out of the difficulty is the one rather cautiously put forward by Professor Santi. Dr. Pierantonelli is unreservedly of the same opinion and sketches with his usual exactness and precision the outlines of a system which appears to be the only one that can be reduced to practice, if we admit that the Tridentine censure can in any way be extended to crimes of a public nature. "We must not," says he, "try to determine the occult nature of a crime in a wholly abstract or absolute form; but we must in all cases come down to the concrete;" and he goes on to reason thus:[2] " . . . Adverbio extrajudicialiter, de sui naturâ opponitur adverbium *judicialiter*, sicut *occulto* opponitur *publicum*. Ideoque, cum Patres (Tridentini) junxerint una simul *occultum* et *extrajudicialiter*, tam late patet in themate unum quam alterum: ne dicatur eos, non obstante tam effrenata dispositione qualis est praesens, voluisse crimina de quibus sufficienter constat manere quandoque impunita . . ."

Having laid down these principles, he draws this conclusion, that since the bishop is obliged to follow always the usual procedure in every criminal matter where there is not an utter impossibility, it follows that "semper delictum in praesenti dici occultum, cum intersint dicta obstacula" whether it be that the witnesses dread to become known to the culprit or that public decency and ecclesiastical dignity call for it. Cavagnis, although unflinching in his demand of a legal procedure for all public misdemeanors, since the scandal has been already given and especially since odious matters are always to be strictly interpreted,[3] nevertheless is,

1. *Ibid.* no 95.

2. Pierantonelli, Praxis, fori eccl. tit. VII, n. 10.

3. *CAVAGNIS, Institutiones Juris Publici*, t. II. cap. III., art. II, n. 60, p. 159: "Jamvero, mens Tridentini fuit impedire peccatorum multiplicationem, etenim quum crimen est occultum, non agitur de impediendo scandalo; sed quando peccatum est publicum, peccatorum multiplicatio aeque impeditur per sententiam judicialem ac ex informatâ conscientiâ; cum autem hoc sit odiosa, utpote exceptionalis, non est praesumendum concilium voluisse eam concedere cum procedi potest servato juris ordine . . ."

in the present case, of our opinion. He remarks very properly that in our modern state of society, episcopal courts are nearly always prevented from proceeding with the necessary rigor and freedom of action by the danger of coming into conflict with the civil enactments, thus begetting endless litigation. They must then do one of two things, either set aside a strict and essential duty, a thing which would not be lawful, or else they must proceed extra-judicially. The learned Professor quotes an example bearing on this matter, which deserves serious attention, since it appears to be a legitimate and thoughtful outcome of his assertions. It is a well-known fact that a few years ago a portion of the Italian clergy took part in a national political movement which to the Catholic world appeared wholly uncalled for and entirely out of place. At the instigation of Charles Passaglia, quite a number forgot themselves so far as to assume a kind of dictatorship or censorship of the Holy See in matters entirely beyond their competence. Nothing would satisfy these unsavory liberals but that the Sovereign Pontiff should renounce once and forever his claims to temporal power. This is not the place to trace the growth and develop the phases of this movement; but we must not forget that the Pope at his election and the Cardinals on receiving the biretta, pledge themselves to defend the integrity of the papal authority. Since Pius V. had decreed severe penalties against such agitators, we can easily understand that the uncalled for action on the part of the advanced party of clericals was supremely imprudent, the consequences of which could not but be detrimental to the best interests of Holy See and the future good of the Catholic world. The repetition of such a scandal had to be avoided at all costs, and measures had to be taken against men ignorant of the rights of the Church and unfortunately too ready and willing to make concessions to her enemies. What could the bishops do? The crime was public; but to demand trial in the ecclesiastical courts would only make it more notorious, the scandal more far-reaching and effective, and draw upon the bishops undoubted reprisals from the Italian government.

The bishops did not hesitate a moment; they had recourse to the suspension "ex informata," and on appeal to Rome their action was sustained and confirmed. There was no other possible mode of punishment. Public conviction before the episcopal tribunal was out of the question, and open scandal to be avoided. There was no trial possible unless an extra-judicial one and consequently an extra-judicial sentence. This example and others of like character, show that we cannot take unreservedly the assertion of Konings who says that recent jurisprudence is in favor of the opinion which confines the suspension "ex informata" to purely hidden and private crimes.[1] But this does not prevent us from repeating with Lucidi that a bishop has every reason to be very careful before settling that a crime is occult and consequently liable to an extra-judicial sentence when in reality it may not be of such a character. By neglecting this precaution he will run the risk of having his decision reversed and annulled, a thing which will redound in no way to his advantage. The doctrine of Bouix, developed and explained in this way, may be followed; but it is not altogether admissible in the absolute form which he has given it, or with the arguments which he uses to support it. We refer the reader to the treatise *de Judiciis* by Bouix, that he may see there how easy it is to compromise a good cause by the use of indiscreet arguments prompted by self-love and passion, when a simple, clear, scientific discussion should be employed.

Dr. Smith was not unaware of the interpretation put on the Council of Trent by Mgr. Santi and the advocate Pierantonelli, but he was absolutely opposed to their views, and time after time he repeats in his writings how impossible to him is their opinion. He grounds his opposition to them and his own opinion on §7 of the instruction of 1884, which reads thus: ad hoc autem ut (culpa) sit occulta, requiritur, ut neque in judicium, neque in rumores vulgi deducta sit, neque insuper ejusmodi numero et qualitate personarum cognita sit unde delictum sit notorium. He adduces also §13

1. *Compend. Theol. Mor.* Tract. de Censuris art. II., No. 1686, p. 324.

which is partly inspired by a sentence from Benedict XIV: "Caeterúm, ex quo istiusmodi poena est remedium ominó extraordinarium, prae oculis habeant Praelati quod reprehensibilis foret episcopus, si in sua synodo declaret se deinceps ex privatâ tantum scientiâ cum poenâ suspensionis a divinis animadversurum in clericos quos graviter deliquisse compererit, *qaamvis eorum delictum non possit in foro externo concludenter probari, aut illud non expediat in aliorum notitiam deducere.*" He refuses to see aught else in the Council of Trent but a way to reach crimes so private that, otherwise, they would wholly escape all ecclesiastical punishment, and he pretends to have found in the document of 1884 especially addressed to this country, a proof and a confirmation of his theory. I scarcely think he will find a single canonist to admit that the instruction of 1884[1] modifies the Tridentine suspension or gives it a different interpretation in the United States.

The document in question merely calls attention to the fact that the Tridentine suspension is still in force, and answers a few popular objections which the action of the Propaganda had left in the public mind. To answer Dr. Smith we think it enough to bring forward a recent example which shows how untenable is his opinion. The Congregation of Bishops and Regulars[2] maintained the validity of a sentence "ex informata" for a crime altogether public. A priest, chaplain to a convent, after several grievous offences, was condemned by a bishop to withdraw from his charge. He refused and his action obliged the nuns to have him expelled by the public authorities. Then he pretended that the sisters had incurred an excommunication by so doing, and he threatened to ventilate matters and expose them in the public press. The bishop who heard of his intention, warned

1. He had already affirmed these ideas in his Elements of Ecclesiastical Law, p. 322, n. 1294: "The negative is the common opinion of canonists, is the one followed in Rome by the Sacred Congregations and held there by canonists, and is, therefore, more correct, nay, at present the only true and safe opinion."

2. S. Congr. EE. et RR. Sancti Josephi de Costarica "Suspensionis et reflectionis damnorum." Aug. 1894.

him to go no further if he wished to avoid unpleasantness. The priest persisted, and on the following day the bishop suspended him "ex informata." The crime was public; the sentence was extra-judicial; still the Congregation declared it valid, confirmed and maintained it.

Pierantonelli's theory seems nowadays to be firmly established; and I think that in the majority of cases, a priest would be very imprudent to attack the validity of the sentence, under plea of the crime being public and notorious; for the actual conditions of society are such that a bishop who wants to do his duty, and at the same time to avoid all useless scandal, has only this means in his power. I am far from wishing to be the apologist of those who would confound all public offences with the few that may be thus punished, for this would be falling into a grave error; my contention is merely that we cannot adopt without due reserve and caution the too positive assertions of the late Dr. Smith.

3. A last condition required for a sentence "ex informata" is that the crime be a serious one;[1] for Rome would never sustain a bishop who inflicts such a punishment for a trifling offence[2].

It is plain, then, what are the motives which justify a bishop for imposing the censure "ex informata." But it may be that the culprit is also anxious to know if all the required conditions are really verified in his case; and so he proceeds to ask his bishop if the crime laid to his charge is indeed occult or equivalent to such; or again, if the penalty is not out of proportion to the offence. The bishop is free to answer or to refuse all information. However, his duty as pastor would oblige him, except in very rare cases, not to withhold such information; for, apart from the fact that a natural sentiment of equity and justice seems to demand it, it affords him an opportunity of giving some sound paternal

1. *Instruction* 1884, ¶ C.—*MESSMER*, *op. cit.* sect. II, art III, n. 94, p. 157. *SMITH Elements* II, n. 1308. p. 328.

2. *S. Congreg. Conc.* 1728. *Analecta J. P.* XIX, 1129.

advice, and of trying to bring back to duty and repentance the erring one[1]. As a strict rule, however, the bishop is not bound to give any explanation, and the Congregations have repeatedly called attention to this particular point as being a kind of natural sequence to the decree of the Council of Trent which authorizes the censure "quomodolibet."

The liberty which the bishop enjoys in regard to giving the reason of his action holds good for the censured alone. To no one else may the bishop make any revelations whatsoever. The crime is occult, and its punishment should be the same. This is the only way to preserve the reputation of an ecclesiastic; any other course would give rise to suspicion, and a priest suspected is practically lost in reputation. Of course some knowledge of the facts may reach the public and convince them that all is not just right. It is morally impossible for a priest to give up the exercise of his ministry without drawing upon himself the remarks of the faithful and the attention of his brother priests; but there are, nevertheless, means to hide to a certain extent this unhappy condition[2]. But no matter how this may be looked upon, the bishop is bound to withhold all information and to do all in his power to keep his knowledge from getting before the public to the detriment of religion and the dishonor of the clergy. If the bishop choose, he may give the priest oral information as to the grounds of the sentence; but he must not write the rea-

1 "Videtur tamen rationi et aequitati consonum, ut Episcopus paterne moneat reum, antequam edat sententiam quoties id fieri potest, nec est periculum aut damnum in morâ. Fieri etenim potest, ut reus admonitus habeat excusationes sufficientes quandoque, quod videbatur omnino certum deprehendetur falsum, adductis explicationibus facti; insuper, forsitan reus paterna caritate sui superioris motus, se emendare sataget, adeo ut jam non sit locus in illum animadvertendi." *ICARD Op. cit. III, p. 109.*

2 Mgr. Messmer suggests several means of avoiding public notice. Thus, he says, a priest suspended extrajudicially might dissimulate his position under various plausible excuses: "He may for reasons of piety, conscience or scrupulosity retire for a while into solitude to collect himself and provide more surely for the salvation of his soul; or he may for temporal causes which are not always given out in public, refrain from some public functions. or go abroad, etc. . . ." *Op cit.* n. 97, p. 162.

sons in the document which conveys the sentence. Although the paper should indicate clearly the nature and import of the punishment, still it should give no clue as to the reasons that justified it. The following formula taken from Monacelli will give an idea how this important document should be drawn up, while observing all the desired conditions. It will be seen that all the points to which we have called attention, are clearly brought out in the formula :

"Constituto Nobis presbyterum N. esse reum criminis, eum ob causas quae animum nostrum digne movent, et de quibus Deo et Sedi Apostolicae, cum habuerimus in mandatis, rationem reddere debemus, et ex informatâ conscientiâ, a divinis suspendimus per (sex) menses, et suspensum declaramus, ac ei decretum suspensionis mandamus.

N. EPISCOPUS N."

Every priest under episcopal jurisdiction is amenable to this suspension. But a bishop will not suspend one of his subjects outside his diocese, especially if the crime has been committed where the bishop has not jurisdiction.[2] Where there is extra-judicial censure the ordinary right of appeal does not exist ;[3] but recourse to the Sovereign Pontiff may always be had ; for the prohibition of the Council of Trent forbidding a priest to appeal to a higher tribunal for revision of his sentence, does not debar recourse to the Pope himself,[4] as we see from the Constitution *Ad militantis* of Benedict XIV, April 1, 1742. The appeal does not suspend the effect of the sentence, and during the action of the Roman Courts the suspension retains its full vigor.

We have given the principal points touching the important question "de suspensione ex informata conscienta." Many other features might have been touched upon, but we were obliged to limit ourselves. Let us conclude this article by a thought taken from Benedict XIV[5] and grounded on expe-

1 MONACELLI—*Formularium* P. III, tit. II ad form. 6. Annot. 3.

2 STREMLER *Op. cit.* p. 332. 3 *Conc. Trid.* loc. cit.

4 "Planum est Tridentinos Patres, nec voluisse, nec potuisse ligare S. Pontificem et prohibere quominus ipse á suis subditis querimonias excipiat : atque de natura est cujuslibet officialis publici ut sit obstrictus ad reddendum Supremo Principi rationem villicationis suae." PIERANTONELLI, *Op cit.* p. 264.

5 BENED. XIV. *De Syn.* lib. XII, cap. VIII, no 6. Instruct. no. 13.

rience, as well as confirmed by the recommendation given in the Instruction of 1884. The suspension ex informata being an extraordinary remedy, let the bishop use it very sparingly and reluctantly, and, as it were, compelled to do so by circumstances beyond his control. Let him be particularly careful not to use it as a mere device to simplify his method of governing by penal restriction, for in this way a power intended for exceptional use would soon degenerate and become an instrument of tyranny to the detriment of order and charity.

G. PÉRIES.

Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

NOTA.—We have substituted the word "appeal" for "recourse" in different parts of the foregoing articles. The author who did not see the proofs desires to have the latter expression retained as marking a distinction in canonical utterance.—ED.

CLERICAL STUDIES.

XXIX.

CHURCH HISTORY (1).

I.

IN one shape or another, Church History has always held a considerable place in Clerical studies. But at no time in the past has it claimed the importance or won the recognition which have been given to it in the latter half of the present century. In every part of the Catholic Church a deeper knowledge of past Christian ages is being actively pursued; local traditions and memories are gathered in, archives explored, special periods studied with minutest care, new and vivid lights brought to bear on events and person-

ages already known; voluminous historical works are ever issuing from the press, while reviews and manuals condense their wealth of information and transmit what is best in it to the student and to the general public.

In all this the Church has only followed the general movement of the age. In the unparalleled intellectual activity of the nineteenth century, spreading out almost in every conceivable direction, two departments of knowledge have had the principal share: Nature and History—the Physical Sciences and the past of the human race. It may be safely said that more work has been done in these two departments than in all the others put together, and that more has come of them; on the one side, an almost total transformation of the conditions and habits of life; on the other, changes hardly less deep in the convictions of men and in their intellectual methods.

History, with which we are concerned here, had always been looked upon as a necessary element of culture, and to be entirely ignorant of it was held by Cicero as keeping a man in the condition of perpetual boyhood. *Nescire quid antequam natus sim acciderit, id est semper esse puerum.* Yet it must be confessed that for many ages its range was very limited, and that long after modern investigation had enlarged its sphere, it still held only a subordinate place in cultivated minds, and was sought for more as a recreation than as a study. But in the present century a radical change has taken place. History has grown into one of the most comprehensive branches of human knowledge, and has come to be looked upon at the same time as one of the most effective forms of mental discipline. A hundred years ago only two such forms were commonly recognized, the classical and the mathematical. In our age two more have been added, the scientific and the historical.

By the discipline of historical study is meat much more more than a mere knowledge of facts and of the lessons they convey. This manner of usefulness had always been recognized. From Cicero and Seneca to Bossuet and Arnold, educators had constantly enlarged on the value of history as

a revelation of human nature in all its shapes, and of the various passions as they work in the souls of men. To history they are wont to send all those whose ambition it was to sway their fellow citizens or whose calling was to govern or guide them. To history, finally, they loved to point as revealing the guiding presence of a divine power amid human events and of a wise Providence shaping them slowly but surely for their appointed ends.

But what the moderns see in the study of History is, besides its direct value, the expansion and vigor it imparts to the faculties and the habits of mind which it begets. Thus they call our attention to the fact that the three leading powers of the soul—the memory, the reason or judgment and the fancy are constantly appealed to and kept in play by historical work, in its various forms of research, testing of evidence, accounting for facts or reducing them to organic unity. Besides, history they tell us expands the sympathies, broadens the mind, awakens interest in things far removed from self; it corrects the narrowness, the vanities, the insular notions of those who have known little outside their surroundings. "History," says Bishop Stubbs, "enables us to approach questions in which we are ourselves engaged with moderate and cautious treatment, to allow some of them to wait for solution, to determine others by the evidence of fact rather than by prepossession, and to let others alone altogether. Historical investigation teaches us patience, tolerance, respect for conflicting views, equitable consideration for conscientious opposition; we see how very differently the men of the particular time seem to have read the course of events which appear to us to have only one reasonable bearing; we see how good and evil mingle in the best of causes; we learn to see with patience the men whom we like the best often in the wrong, and repulsive men often in the right; we learn to recognize that the cause which we love best has suffered from the awkwardness of its defenders so great disparagement as in strict equity to justify the men who were assaulting it. We learn, too, and this is not the least of the lessons, that there are many points on

which no decision as to right or wrong, good or evil, acquittal or condemnation is to be looked for, and on which we may say that, as often the height of courage is to say, I dare not and the height of love is to say I will not, so the height of wisdom is to have learned to say, I do not know." (Stubbs Lectures on History, 5th Lecture.)

II.

But irrespective of these and other similar benefits, history, simply as a picture of the past, has assumed in our generation an interest unparalleled at any other time. Our curiosity in regard to what has gone before us has become boundless; it grows steadily with what is meant to satiate it. Just as we want to know what is happening day by day far and near in the present, so we strive to ascertain what happened long ago, here where we live, and all over the world. It is the function of history to tell us, and the industry, the sagacity, the untiring energy put forth by the hundreds who pursue their researches in every civilized country are fully equalled by the accumulation of historic wealth added each year to the common store. Thus to the explorers of Palestine, of Assyria, of Egypt, these old countries are yielding up secrets lost for centuries in their depopulated wastes, or hidden in their sands. By their discoveries ancient history is carried back centuries beyond its former limits; unknown forms of civilization are brought to light; archaeology, philology, folklore, inscriptions, coins, medals, every kind of testimony is listened to, weighed, combined with already ascertained facts to become ultimately part of a structure broader, more solid and nobler than ever. The methods of investigation are being constantly perfected, and under their more scientific rules, facts and conclusions long in possession are submitted to newer and severer tests, and in many particulars the judgment of past ages are reversed.

Meanwhile, for periods less remote, the accumulation of accessible materials is simply bewildering. Within the last fifty years the archives of most of the courts of Europe have

been fully thrown open for the first time, and the secrets of Church and State, hidden for centuries, have become public property, with the result of modifying deeply the most accredited and widespread opinions.

It is in this way that history has become in our time one of the leading objects of interest, wherever any degree of intellectual culture has entered. To this we owe the number of books on historical subjects coming forth from the press in an unceasing stream; hence also studies, memoirs, biographies, the abundant supply of historical articles to be found in our magazines, in our reviews and even in our daily papers; hence the historical societies established almost everywhere, with their special organs devoted exclusively to facts and discussions which help to light up the past.

But the historic spirit of the age has extended itself farther still, in fact incomparably beyond what was long considered the proper sphere of historical science. From the purely political interests of nations and the lives of great men, it has gradually come to embrace all the other important aspects of human existence. Side by side with the political histories of peoples, we have in our day their constitutional, their economic, their industrial, their literary history. It is felt that everything human has a history of its own, because in every human there is a living development, a growth and transformation of elements which the attentive eye can follow, and that it is only by following them thus that they can be properly understood. In this way a history has been worked out of all the principal forms of human knowledge. We have a history of the arts, of the sciences; a history even of what seems least subject to change; theology, metaphysics and mathematics. In fact the historical spirit is everywhere, and history itself has come to be looked at less as a special science than a special aspect of every science.

III.

This then is the great fact which the clerical student has to set clearly before his eyes. He lives in an age when his-

torical studies have assumed an importance quite unique; in which historical methods are familiar to all cultivated minds; in which historical demonstrations and conclusions have more weight than any others. In the ages of faith authority reigned supreme; later on, abstract principles and logical deductions were predominant; in our day facts and inductions are everything; the facts and inductions of science on one side, the facts and inductions of history on the other. It follows that no aspirant to the priesthood, hoping one day to influence his fellowmen, can fail to lay hold of so formidable a power and learn to wield it. The more he is prepared to appeal to history on any subject, the surer he is to get a hearing. In his own special department, history will go farther than any other argument to sustain his positions.

But, let it be remembered, this domain is not exclusively his, though he may call it his own, and at every step he will find himself in contact with the secular historian handling with the same freedom as himself the facts and problems of Church history. Nor can he complain of this as an intrusion, for Church history is, after all, only a special aspect of general history inextricably mingled with the rest. It is the province of the historian to take in all the great facts and forces of the past, and Religion is unquestionably one of the greatest. Religious influences reckon among the deepest, the most abiding, the most productive of great and decisive events in the life of humanity, and the historian is bound to recognize, to appreciate and to judge them. Even events that are religious in their substance have almost all a secular side. Take such facts as the investitures, the crusades, the reformation of the XVIth century; take the whole series of relations between Church and State from Constantine to the French Revolution; what subjects more religious, yet what more secular?

To such questions—and they are numberless—the clerical student evidently cannot remain a stranger. He is one day to be, not only the exponent but the defender of religious truth, the armed champion of the Church, and history will be the scene of his hottest engagements.

It is now nearly a hundred years since de Maistre wrote that during the two previous centuries what is called history seemed to be nothing but a vast conspiracy against the truth, and it must be confessed that the present age is far from having won a reversal of the sentence. True, there is much less of blind passion and of barefaced lying; there is often an evident wish to be fair; some of the most beautiful and touching homages ever paid to the Church have been written in this century by men who denied her divine authority or who were even strangers to all Christian faith. But how much still remains among the most enlightened and most equitable of unconscious prejudice, of misapprehension, and consequent misstatement of motives and of facts! How much among the great majority of non-Catholic writers of overt or latent hostility; what readiness to grasp at and magnify anything that may tell against the Church; what readiness to admit the most damaging imputations on the slenderest evidence, sometimes on mere suspicion, or on the unscrupulous statement of an obscure or unreliable writer.

To remove in some measure this accumulated mass of error; to wipe from the face of the Church every manner of defilement by which the hand of man may have tarnished her divine beauty, becomes the duty of every Catholic priest. But for no other part of his work does he need a more thorough equipment. The adversaries of his faith are often men of great gifts and thoroughly conversant with the subject, clergymen of various denominations or laymen not unfrequently strangers to all Christian belief. It is on the field of history that they will have chiefly to be met. For Christianity and the Church claim to be primarily and principally great historic facts; consequently it is by history that they must stand or fall. When the real value of institutions is judged by the measure in which they have helped to sustain and carry forward the human race, authorities and arguments are of little avail; facts and only facts are practically admitted in testimony; and so to facts, that is to history, the defender of the faith has to turn; with facts, those of his opponent or his own, he has all the time to deal, whether

to controvert, or to prove, or to explain them. In other words, the controversialist, the apologist of the day has to be, first of all, a historian.

IV.

But this is, after all, only a secondary aspect of the case. Irrespective of all contention and controversy, the study of Church History is, itself, of surpassing interest and benefit to the enlightened Catholic generally, and still more to the cleric and to the priest. All that attracts the ordinary reader in secular history is to be found in it, often in a higher degree. The grand "march past" of bygone generations in the striking variety of their manners; the ever changing show of life, as it was lived for centuries; the great events which shaped the destinies of the world; the hidden drama of human passions laid bare, and behind them the gravest and most solemn issues,—all these impressive and thrilling features abound in the annals of the Church no less than in the history of the nations.

To the loyal Catholic especially whatever bears upon the Church in the past as well as in the present becomes at once interesting. Her history to him is like a family record. It is also like the records of the people to which he belongs. And as the name of his country means little for the man who knows nothing of her past, whereas if her memories be vividly impressed upon his soul that same name will suffice to fire his imagination and strengthen him for the noblest deeds, so the history of the Church, her glories, her triumphs, the inestimable benefits which the world owes her fills the Christian's heart with a sacred enthusiasm, strengthens his faith and transforms his life into a homage of loyalty and love.

This is why we notice that in all the Catholic Reading Circles recently established through the country, Church history is invariably taken up as one of the leading subjects of study. The members feel that they owe it to themselves to know as much as they can of the past of the great Institu-

tion to which they are proud to belong, and that no other manner of knowledge will be more helpful to raise their minds to a higher level and strengthen them in the Faith.

This very fact makes it additionally necessary that the priest should be familiar with the principle elements and bearings of the subject. Its growing prominence, inside as well as outside the Church, among the faithful as well as among strangers, exposes him to be appealed to, at every turn, for a statement of principles, or an explanation of facts or for guidance in the study of special periods or events.

Indeed his own studies, as we have repeatedly seen, all lead him back in the same direction. Dogmatic Theology is a living science only on condition of being animated by history. Each doctrine has its special growth, its successive forms and manifestations, its developments born of contact with other truths, its struggles against error, its adjustment, often slow and difficult yet highly interesting, with other kinds of knowledge. To follow it through all these various phases is essential to a thorough understanding of it, and what is that but to master its history?

The same holds good of moral doctrines, of Church discipline, of Liturgy, of Ascetical and Mystical Theology. They all have their history, as has been already shown, and only through it can they be properly understood and appreciated. Lastly, the life of the cleric and of the priest is more completely identified than any other with the life of the Church. Her thoughts, her aims, her interests, her fluctuating fortunes are all theirs in an especial sense. Her history is, as it were, the home of their minds, a second memory by which they live in her past, as by their personal memory they dwell in their own, and make it an abiding part of their being. It is there they find the highest inspirations of religion, the best experiences of human life accumulated through ages. The History of the Church, like the Bible itself, is the record of God's dealings with His people, teaching the same lessons and conveying the same comforting assurances. "We," wrote the Jewish High-priest, (I Mach. XII) "need naught else having for our comfort the

holy books that are in our hands." So the Catholic priest, if he be thoroughly familiar with the records of the Church, needs little else for his own edification and that of others. After the Inspired Writings, nowhere can he find instruction more abundant, maturer wisdom, more stimulating examples. In a word, to no other intellectual pursuit can his hours of leisure be more delightfully and fruitfully devoted.

But this once agreed upon, question after question arises as to the special objects to have in view, the methods to follow, the books to use, the spirit in which the work has to be done, etc., all which must be reserved for another occasion.

J. HOGAN.

St. John's Seminary, Boston, Mass.

THE UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF ARCHBISHOP SEGHERS.

Continued[1]

THE delicate health of young Father Seghers did not prevent him from doing the work of four priests. He had truly become "all to all." People of all classes and nationalities loved and admired him. "Oh, if I had only one more priest like him," the Bishop wrote to Louvain; and a priestly friend said in a letter from the Far West: "Father Seghers is doing wonders in Victoria. He is so young and so kind; he is an excellent preacher, a beautiful

1 See AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, August, 1896, p. 169

singer, and a splendid pianist." A priest from Bretagne offers his services to Bishop Demers, through Mgr. De Neve, but Father Seghers writes on May 11, 1866:

"Take it for granted that if he does not spend a few years in Louvain College, both to learn English and to imbibe the spirit, with which the college is overflowing, he will not become as useful as he might be . . . I feel exceedingly obliged to you for the few words of encouragement you have directed to me. I ask you never to write to me without saying something of the same kind. Such language electrifies and revives me. . . . You speak of crosses, and you have a right to do so; but my crosses, though real, seem to be something else, I know not what. Sickness, suffering, bodily privations and things of that kind, are generally regarded as crosses. Such trials I have none. Troubles and difficulties, closely connected with my ministry, sometimes rouse my anger, though I think only of God's honor. But it might be a thousand times better to take them easy, and remember that they *are* crosses, and not make so much ado about them."

"The Oblate Fathers will soon leave us to work in British Columbia. From this out, the great difficulty of the Bishop will be to form a clergy for the diocese. The Indian Missions will be all abandoned. I cannot leave Victoria; his Lordship does not allow me to be one day absent from here. Heavens! What will become of us, if the college is thrown on our hands, together with the Indian Missions."

He asks for books, chiefly dictionaries this time, and for Church music, and concludes with the information that the Bishop leaves during the following week, for either Australia or South America, to collect funds for his poor diocese. "We may be left alone for two years. Pray, and make others pray."

The departure of the Bishop left again the administration of the diocese in the hands of the zealous Missionary, who cheerfully submitted his shoulders to the burden. "Abraham said to his son: "Deus providebit, fili mi," and I suppose I may say and think the same." Thus he consoles himself in a letter, written October 1, 1866, in which he thanks God and the Rector for the cheering news about a student of the American College, who is soon to be his fellow missionary, Mr. Jonckan:

"And now, dear Rev. Father, I heartily thank you for the interest you take in me. I really do not know how and where I have deserved it; but I

assure you I never let one day pass without saying more than one prayer for you. And I am so disposed that a word from you makes me forget scores of troubles, and raises my mental energy to its highest pitch."

By the same mail, he sent a most interesting letter, full of sound advice, to his countryman at the college, Mr. J. J. Jonckan, who afterwards became his Vicar General, and was a pattern of truly apostolic zeal up to his dying hour.

"When I was reading your letter, I did not know what sorts of exclamations escaped my lips; for, during a few minutes, I was really foolish with joy. I wished to express my happiness in an extraordinary way, but I did not know how. I danced and laughed until the tears came from my eyes; I had to read your letter twice before I could realize the thought of a young Belgian priest arriving here at the beginning of next year. You may imagine how I thanked God and the Blessed Virgin. . . . And now, as regards your blessed letter itself, I cannot thank you for the expression of your profound homage, because here, in America, we do not grow fat on those things, and, if you do entertain such an opinion of your humble servant, you will be obliged to change it after your arrival. You ask information about our Vancouver Islands: I cannot tell you much about the weather at the different seasons, because the weather is so variable that one cannot understand it. During my first Winter here, it rained nearly every day; during the second Winter, I do not know what the weather did, as I had no time to care for it; during the third Winter it was pretty cold, not so cold, however, as in Belgium. But the wind blows terribly. It seems as if the devil had directed the bellows, with which he keeps the fires of hell alive, against Victoria to blow the whole town to blazes. La Fontaine's 'Le plus terrible des enfants, que le Nord jusque là eut porté dans ses flancs' is nowhere when compared with 'les enfants que l'Ouest porte ici dans ses flancs.' I assure you that if we had houses built of stone, and some of the comforts of Belgium, Victoria would be the best, the nicest, the most agreeable place that could be found anywhere. A mild Winter and cool breezes during Summer, with the most picturesque and enchanting surroundings, make it a veritable terrestrial paradise."

He now advises his young friend to bring with him all the books he has, regretting that he left in Belgium his own college-books, such as dictionaries, geometries, algebras and "les auteurs classics grecs et latins." Bishop Demers has, at the disposal of all, the Cursus Completus of Migne's Theology and Sacred Scripture. He also tells Jonckan to provide himself with good and solid clothing, and to remember that even St. Paul had more than one overcoat. (II. Tim. iv. 13).

"Bring along all the Church goods that you can buy, and as much money as you can obtain for yourself." Then follow directions for the journey: to sail from Liverpool to New York, where he is to call on Father Quinn (the former Rector of St. Patrick's Cathedral); from New York by Panama to San Francisco, where the Archbishop will give him a kind reception.

"Here is something which you *must* bring along with you: a good provision of courage and of a strong will, lasting for a life time, 'le feu de l'ardeur' to undertake, and 'l'assez de la constance et de l'énergie' to persevere. These two qualities are not often found together in the same man. Bring as much learning and knowledge as you can acquire. Try especially to know English thoroughly, and to prepare yourself to preach well in that tongue. Protestant service consists principally in a sermon, and, strange to say, many of our Catholics also consider the sermon the most important part of our services."

"Carry also with you a solid foundation of virtue, and the fixed resolution *never* to omit your meditation in the morning, or your examination of conscience at night, and *never* to neglect your Rosary. To follow here a certain rule of life is impossible, but to neglect those things is dangerous. I dare say: *woe to the priest* who does not say Mass every day, when he has an opportunity of saying it. Bring too a spirit of complete submission to your Bishop, and a sincere respect for him. No, this would not be enough; we must love our Bishop, and love him as if he were our own father, no matter what others say against him. There are people, Catholics, in this diocese, as in other dioceses, who have lying tongues, and say all kinds of evil things against their Bishop, and if a young priest is not forewarned, he may be influenced by such wicked talk, and perhaps be prevented from doing good."

"You see I am preaching to you; still I do not tell you anything different from that which our beloved Rector teaches the students. Listen to me: when the Rector gives his practical talks, open widely both your ears, and let his advice sink deeply into your mind and heart. Without his lessons, I would have been like a lost sheep." "Be ready to practice here what they call 'l 'esprit de renoncement et de sacrifice.' 'Omnia omnibus factus.' Come then and put your hand to the wheel of the chariot of Religion, not to make thousands of conversions—the St. Xaviers are not so numerous as they imagine in Belgium—but to advance the work begun by others, and to commence yourself some good work, which may be continued by our successors in the holy ministry, and after we have spent our health and life and all that we have, let us then say: 'servi inutiles sumus.' . . . I have Beelen's Commentaries on St. Paul's 'ad Romanos and ad Philippenses,' and would like to get Beelen's other works. Buy me also the work of the Marquis de Mirville (le livre des ésprits), provided, of course, my uncle gives you the necessary money. . . . Here a priest must be disposed,

to forgive injuries; sometimes it may be a harsh word from the Bishop, or some smarting remarks from a colleague. Naturally, one becomes mad, but then the storm soon subsides, and one forgives and forgets. Persons who forgive and do not forget, will hardly agree or live happily together, especially if they are of different nationalities. You will meet many dangers and difficulties, and you need a great confidence in God's assistance. The severest trials and most extraordinary consolations make up the life of a missionary. . . . Do not be in too a great a hurry to leave Louvain College. You cannot know English too well. Were I to consider only the wants of the Diocese, I would say: Come as soon as possible.

On the other hand, however, it will be better to go slowly, to let the Rector arrange matters, and to make a good and solid preparation for your active, priestly life. . . . Before leaving Belgium visit all your friends and mine, and entreat them to pray constantly for our missions."

The busy Rector of the college does not write as frequently as his former pupil would have him do. Complainingly he says, in a letter, dated August 1, 1867:

"It is certain that you have quite forgotten me; for the last eight or nine months I have received no letter, no word of encouragement, no line of consolation. I do not mean to blame you; I fancy you say that I am big enough and old enough to go on by myself. I wish it were so! And I also presume that you have now so many pupils and better children and more deserving ones to care for, that I have been crowded out of your heart. Well, I accept my fate with resignation, but not without inward feelings of sorrow and loneliness. In vain have I looked for some encouraging and animating letter from the old country, but all my expectations have been frustrated, and disappointment came on disappointment. . . . And do you know what I have done to avenge myself? I have commenced to read the letters of St. Francis Xavier, and I find there plenty of what I need. So, I have made up my mind that if Father Rector has forgotten me, I should look for somebody else to speak to my heart in a language which so seldom rings in our ears in this bleak country."

"Do not imagine, however, that I wish to return to Belgium. By no means. I am contented and happy and wish but one thing, that is to end my days without losing the spirit, which I have been happy enough to inhale in our Catholic Belgium."

Here follows a long list of books which the Rector is requested to buy and send him; his uncle would "foot the bill." Finally, the Rector replies in a brief note, announcing Father Jonckan's speedy arrival in Victoria. To this Father Seghers answered:

"Your short epistle was gratefully received, so much the more, because I commenced to think that I had been thronged out of your heart. I hope

it is not the case, and will not be, until I am able to go ahead by myself. I eagerly desire to stand always in relation to you as a son to his father. . . . Father Jonckan will probably be placed in charge of a beautiful mission, with a small number of Catholics, to convert heretics and infidels and attend to an Indian camp. May God bless him and give him a prosperous journey! . . . I will put your kind advice into practice, though I assure you that I have been often nearly discouraged. I dare say you ought to get headaches, when you read so many letters of your former students; they, of course, feel relieved in unloading upon you their cares and troubles. I sometimes feel really ashamed of talking so much about myself, instead of giving you descriptions of our island and its missions. . . . On the western coast there should be missions started, but those places would require nothing short of saints. An ordinary priest will not be able to stand it. A cold, rainy, unwholesome climate; wild Indians addicted to drink; a rocky soil unfit for raising cattle or vegetables; no communication with the outer world, except by canoes on a rough sea; at least a hundred and fifty miles distant from Victoria; a region where a missionary priest never yet set his foot. Oh, what shall become of those poor, forlorn Indians? I certainly cannot tell you. Pray, and please to get others to pray for them."

In November, 1867, Fr. Seghers penned a letter, in which he unconsciously revealed the beauty of his priestly heart to his former Superior:

"Time fails me to write a long letter. I am, as usual, in good health, and I feel satisfied and happy, although off and on I have some little crosses to carry, but I am by no means discouraged. I look for trials and I prepare myself for them, but I do not think any adversity will be strong enough to depress my spirits. The only thing I am losing, amidst trials and difficulties, is the sweetness of devotion. I can no longer pray as tenderly, and I should say, as childlike, as I used to pray before; but I don't think I have lost a bit of faith, hope or charity. If I always speak of myself in my letters, it is that you should never forget your son, who was always more attached to you than you ever fancied. . . . To tell you the truth, dear Father Rector, I am of the opinion that the American College is destined to do more good on the Pacific shores than in the Eastern States."

"The youthful ardor of Louvain priests, especially natives of Belgium, when stirred or checked, as needs be, by a Bishop in whom they have confidence, will be an excellent element for the Church of the West. 'Quod vidi oculis meis, quod perspexi annuntio tibi.' . . . Let then the aspirations of the generous and self-forgetting Levites of Louvain turn towards our lonely shores; but a priest, who comes out hither, must be able to be his own rule. He must be fitted to act for himself, without being under the eyes of a Superior. I deem it my duty to tell you these things, because I am inclined to believe that you think too little of this part of the country, and devote too much attention and solicitude to other parts more civilized. But I dare say, priests will soon be numerous elsewhere, while here the clergy

is still to be formed. It is all important to have, at the very beginning, such priests as will, like those formerly in the American College, give a good direction to the aspirations and exertions of all.

"This is *my* wish, but I do not know whether it is the wish of God. If His will is contrary to mine, *fiat, fiat!* He knows better; He judges without prejudice or impartiality. I conclude, because want of time prevents me from writing any more. And I am in such a hurry, that, were I to write any longer, I would only talk nonsense. I remain as ever,

"Your faithful and affectionate son in J. C.

"Victoria, V. I.; Feast of St. Martin, the glorious patron of the parish in which I was born."

A month later he finds time to write a long letter in English and Latin, which contains sound advice for the future missionaries at the College, while it shows a mind fixed on the honor of God and His Holy Church.

"I was glad that you called my attention to 'la folle du logis;' it really was very much needed at present. Sometimes, when saying Mass or reading my office, my head does not seem to be on my shoulders; and my heart follows my head, or my head follows my heart, I do not know which. Be it as it may, I will strive to put your advice into practice. . . . I believe you when you say you have not forgotten me, and I hope you never will. If you knew what an amount of good your paternal letters do me, you would certainly say that writing to me pays well.

"I do not know how I feel just now. It is as if I could actually weep, not for grief or joy, but for something which I cannot tell. Perhaps it is gratitude. My heart is not in Louvain; my heart is here; and still, when I am scribbling, it is as if my whole soul were in my pen. . . . Father Jonckan has arrived safely. . . . I do rejoice 'in adventu Titi.' I hate to be hasty in forming my opinion of him, but I have sufficient reasons to believe that he will be *the* man. You tell me that you thought I was in great abundance, and you are surprised that I am not, because I am hungry; but you forget that 'qui edunt talia adhuc esuriunt, et qui bibunt adhuc sitiunt. Qui enim habet, dabitur ei et abundabit.' These are the things of which we may say in truth 'l'appetit vient en mangeant.' You add that I have not as yet learned what it is to be hungry, and this is true, though we keep the last place, in a barren country.

"Jam nunc in mentem mihi venit scribere ad te de rebus, quas in his regionibus, hisce oculis vidi; olim tacui, nunc autem flens dico. Tu, Reverende Domine, ad beneplacitum tuum his litteris uteris; quod si prorsus inanes tibi esse videantur, placet ut eas comburas. Sacerdos quidam alicujus congregationis religiosae, natione Gallus, duobus abhinc mensibus (horribile dictu!) fidem Catholicam negavit, sectae Anglicanae nomen dedit, et in eo est, ux mox minister fiat in una ex hujus sectae ecclesiis. Haec scribo, Dei gloriam unice intendens; valde utile mihi videtur, ut

noveris pericula, quae sacerdotibus harum regionum maximopere vitanda sunt. Jam vero, ut opinor, hanc detestabilem consuetudinem conservandi in cubiculo et legendi, absque licentia Episcopi, libros haeretica pravitate infectos, maxime damnandam esse certum est. Tot dantur libri optima indole conscripti, quot nemo in vitae suae curriculo legere poterit, et ecce, quidam (quos novi) ex corruptis fontibus errorem haurire conantur! Nihil periculosius et nihil stultius. Jam nunc facta rei veritatem probant. Liceat etiam mihi, Reverende Domine, a te efflagitare, ut alumnos Seminarii doceas, non tantum honore praevenire Episcopos suos, sed et eos diligere et, ut patres, amare; non quia ipsi amentur, sed quia Episcopi sacro charactere sint insigniti. Nihil datur iniquius quam spiritus ille independentiae, quo non raro inferior clerus quamdam, ut ita dicam, revolutionem molitur. Dixi: non raro; parum hoc, oportet dicere 'saepesaepius et fere quotidie.' Jam antea longam et protractam epistolam scribere inceperam, in qua latius haec exponere conatus eram. Sed nesciens quousque tibi accepta foret, hanc nuperrime projeci in ignem.

"Faxit Deus ut non incassum laboraverim! Sed haec mihi jam perspecta habeo; nihil magis obsonum esse quam censuras et animadversiones inferioris cleri in ea quae facit Episcopus. Nam primum quidem sacerdotes particularia vident; Episcopus vero cunctam diocesim suam prae oculis habere tenetur. Deinde saepesaepius contingit, Episcopum quodam agere modo ob certas rationes, de quibus ne verbum quidem alienis auribus insufflare ipsi licet. Sed de his, ut puto, satis. . . . If Father Jonckan does not send you a letter by this mail, throw the blame on me. I advised him not to write, because I do not like to see a priest write under first impressions, which a new place makes on his mind. He will write in three weeks. I am under great obligations to you for the books you have taken the trouble to send me; I also notice that you sent me several of your own. . . . Unum, si libet, adhuc verbulum addam; cum certior factus essem de casu infelicis istius sacerdotis, verba haec in Evangelio, cum incredibili animi commotione, perlegi: 'Attendite a falsis prophetis, qui veniunt ad vos in vestimentis ovium, intus autem sunt lupi rapaces.' Et haec verba de ministris protestantibus intelligenda esse, mihi persuasum habeo. Idcirco aegro animo fero quod quandoque sacerdotes nimia familiaritate cum istis lupis versentur; revera, ni christiana caritas me impediret, ego incredibili odio falsos hos prophetas persequerer; et valde mihi molestae sunt omnes amicitiae hujuscemodi, Catholicorum cum ministris sectarum protestantium. Si christiana plebs docenda est, ut a falsis attendant prophetis, quidni nos ab iisdem fugiamus? Haec, ut opinor, certa sunt: Imo. Dictum sacerdotem blanditiis ministrorum irretitum cecidisse et 2ndo. ministros omnes, paucis exceptis, una prae caeteris animi qualitate esse insignes; diabolica nempe hypocrisi. Unum factum referam: Quemdam novi ministrum, qui frequenter Episcopi aedes adibat, et tam cum ipso Episcopo, quam cum quodam pio valde sacerdote de religione Catholica, deque rebus ecclesiae garrulabatur. Spem maximam fovebat clerus, fore ut minister ille mox Catholicam religionem amplecteretur. Sed ille, relicta insula, in Angliam rediit ubi, librum de hac

regione tractantem edidit, in quo omnia quae ex ore Episcopi audiverat, tanquam ad scopum suum utilia referre studuit. En ejus conversio! Non semel vidi familiarem vivendi modum inter sacerdotes et ministros ad populi scandalum vertere; ut nihil dicam de periculo cui sacerdotes se ipsos exponunt. . . .

"You say in your letter, in regard to my present trials here: 'Deus dabit his quoque finem.' Well, although God has not put an end to them yet, there is tranquillitas. Foris pugnae, intus etiam pugnae, sed pugnae miro modo tranquillae, et impraesentiarum, timores nulli. Ora, quaeso, pro

"Amantissimo filio tuo in Christo Jesu,
"C. S."

WILLIAM STANG.

American College, Louvain.

(*To be continued.*)

SOME NOTES ON THE PROJECTED REFORM OF THE ROMAN BREVIARY UNDER BENEDICT XIV.[1]

THIRD PAPER.

IN two former papers, we told the story of the Projected Revision of the Roman Breviary under Benedict XIV, depicted its complexion, showed the Pope's appreciation of it, his own ideas of reform, and how it was he was never able to carry them out.

It rests now for us to note, to draw conclusions, and, if need be, to criticise. In doing so we shall be only fulfilling Pope Benedict's own querulous prognostication—"Now with whatever care, and with whatever ability the new breviary be drawn up, captious critics will have their say."

The first point which strikes one on examining the consultors' revision, is the fidelity with which they clung to the time-honored Roman traditions. The antique elements of the Roman office were, for them, beyond the pale of discussion; their mission, as they conceived it, was to correct, and not to re-make the breviary, and Benedict, as we have seen, confirmed this view.

Here we have the grand characteristic which differentiates their labors from the labors, alike of Ferreri and Quignon and of the Gallican liturgists of the eighteenth century—the pivot upon which any rational revision of the Roman breviary will have to gyrate, for customs hallowed by an unbroken tradition of at least a thousand years can only be swept away at the risk of wrecking the very life of the constitution with which they are so intimately interwoven—a risk which no prudent man, without being driven to it by necessity, would willingly run, and, in the present case, as Benedict's consultors clearly saw, as did also before them the revisers of St. Pius V, no such necessity existed. For them, and, we will add, for us, "the old fashion of praying is good."

1 Histoire du Breviaire Romain par Pierre Batiffol, Lit. D.—Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils.

A second point deserves attention. The consultor's method of revision did not run counter to, but was in conformity with the method of revision adopted by St. Pius V. This is most important. In so doing they showed their sound conservative good sense, on this score they merit the highest commendation, for the Breviary of St. Pius V—the breviary be it born in mind as it stands to-day is, as we have seen, the lineal descendant, in an indirect line if you will, but for all that, the sole surviving lineal descendant of and structurally at least, identical with the canonical office of Rome such as it was celebrated in the basilica of St. Peter's, at the close of the seven hundreds, which in its turn was a composition purely Roman made up of elements some Roman, some non-Roman, some of them undoubtedly tracing their origin to the very cradle of Christianity.

This it is which renders so precious, alike in the eyes of the Catholic and the archæologist, the Breviary of St. Pius V. Here we have the motive which impelled the consultors to maintain the ancient structural form of office, to leave even the details of the oldest portion of the breviary, the *Temporale*, intact, and though, indeed, they laid rude hands on the Kalendar and on the Sanctoral, it was because they were firmly convinced, on the faith even of the Tridentine liturgists themselves, that St. Pius' intention had been to reduce the *Sanctorale* for the benefit of the *Temporale*—to multiply, in conformity with ancient usage, the Dominical and Ferial offices, at the expense of the offices of the Saints.

Whether or not the consultors were well-advised in taking this view anent the Kalendar is a matter open to discussion, but it was an opinion very generally held in their day, and they were supported in it, as we have seen, by the highest ecclesiastical authority, by no less a personage than Benedict XIV himself. Gueranger on the other hand adopts the opposite opinion—see his Institutions Liturgiques—and one of his disciples in the columns of the Tablet, some five years since (we ourselves had the pleasure of translating his letters for him) has said perhaps all that can be said in favor of it. For the rest, the Church's action since the days of Benedict

seems, at first sight, confirmatory of Dom Gueranger's view, but it should be borne in mind that the additions to the Kalender in modern times have been, at least to a certain extent, inspired by motives of practical utility, with a view to lightening, in behalf of an attenuated and over-charged priesthood, the burden of canonical office. Moreover alike the grandest and the most ancient portion of the Divine *cursus*, the superior beauty of the *Temporale* is beyond dispute, nor can we but regret the necessity, if necessity there be, of continnally interrupting its harmonious cadence. In the beginning this was not so ; feasts of Saints and martyrs were then comparatively few, and their offices were chanted, not instead of, but in addition to, the office of the day. Hence the origin of the term double festivals, days, that is, on which two offices were celebrated. One cannot then but sympathize with the consultors' desire for a more frequent recitation of the Ferial office.

That the Kalendar needed a judicious thinning there can be little room for doubt—it needs it still. Festivals which moved the faithful in the seventh, the tenth, the thirteenth centuries, now pass by unheeded. Who can deny that the devotion, for example, to the Sanctuary of Mount Gargano as it exists to-day, would not warrant the introduction of the festival of St. Michael's Apparition. The Kalendar is not the Martyrology, nor does the suppression of a festival necessarily mean the suppression of the object worshipped, and if because a name has once been inserted in the Kalendar it is to remain there forever, the day will surely come, nay, it is fast coming, when every free day will be filled up. How then, are we to find room for newer, and simply because we know more about them, dearer objects of worship ?

A judicious periodical pruning of the old Kalendrical tree would then seem to be indispensable, but whether the consultors' pruning was judicious is quite another question, and only on the hypothesis that the Sabbath was not made for man, but man for the Sabbath, can their method be justified ; for so in love were they with antiquity, that they determined to maintain the old, simply because it was old, and apart from

any other considerations. Hence they left all the dry stocks—stocks which had long since ceased to bear any fruit of devotion, and ruthlessly cut away countless healthy young shoots full of life and vigor. The list of expurgated feasts including as it did, names among the most venerated and best beloved in the Kalendar, as Batiffol says, in his exaggerated French fashion, is enough to make one weep, and though, good reader, neither you nor I will shed tears over an attempted act of vandalism which circumstances foiled a hundred years ago, we cannot but be glad that the projects of Valenti and his comrades anent the Kalendar were never carried out.

The task before them was a delicate and difficult one, and in our humble opinion, so far as concerns the Kalendar, they failed in its accomplishment; the problem which had to be settled was a problem of practical piety, and their solution of it, was the solution of archæological pedants. But if our commissioners were not to be guided by archæology, what other principle should have inspired their action? Popular devotion perhaps; but popular devotion is variable, and from country to country varies. Why not have abolished altogether the common *Proprium Sanctorum*, and left it to each ecclesiastical province to settle its own *Sanctorale*, subject, of course, to the approval of the Holy See? Such a system would have been but an extension of the system of local supplements still in vogue, and the Dominical and Ferial office might have been to a certain extent safeguarded by granting to the Sunday office, as do to this day the English Benedictine Congregation, and to the offices of privileged Ferials, precedence over double feasts, and by making some such modification in the rubrics relative to the translation of festivals, as Leo XIII effected some ten years since, while at the same time—still following the track of tradition—they might have conciliated the good will of those who desired a shorter office, firstly, by a judicious curtailment of the Ferial and Dominical lessons, and for this a precedent might have been found in the action of the liturgists of the thirteenth century. Secondly, by cutting off the remaining accretions which still,

even after St. Pius' correction, encumbered the Dominical and Ferial office—the suffrages of the Saints, the Athanasian creed, and if need be also, even the Sunday Te Deum. Thirdly, by so arranging the nine psalms of Prime, that no one of them should be sung more than once a week—the *Deus in nomine*, the *Beati immaculati* and the *Retribue servo tuo*, for example on Sunday, the five proper Ferial psalms at present in use, on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, one only on each day, and the Confitemini on Saturday. In doing so the consultors would only have been following in the footsteps of their *beau ideal* St. Pius, who had himself already modified the ancient distribution of Primal Psalmody.

The last point to which we would call attention is the correction of the breviary text. If one may justly be severe with the Kalendrical changes proposed by Benedict's congregation, it is only fair to acknowledge the scrupulous care with which they set about the correction of the breviary text.

The lectionary, at least, needed correction—there is no doubt whatever about it, and though some amendments have since been made, it needs it unhappily still.

Moreover our consultors were well fitted so far as the critical knowledge of the age allowed, to undertake the work in hand. They had equipped themselves with the weapons of the first liturgical scientists of the day, men like Cave, for example, and Mabillon and Ruinart, and Tomassi and Fleury, and above all Tillemont. Thoroughly imbued with their sentiments in this matter they were determined to take away the scandal of making people read in the name of the church legends which they regarded as either doubtful or untrue, and if nowadays owing to the advance made by critical science, and to the greater certainty which archaæological research has given to some of our legends, the Bollandists, for example, are in a position to faithfully correct the lectionary in a sense more conservative than did the consultors of Benedict XIV, who can blame these latter for their untiring zeal in regard to what they deemed to be the interest of truth?

The same thoughts occur to one in relation to antiphon, to

respond and to verse, qualified by this other, that, as such compositions partake of a more or less poetical character, greater license is permissible in their case, than in compositions professing to give an unvarnished record of historical facts. This, at least, is the general feeling nowadays. To us the singing of the antiphons of St. Agnes, of St. Lucy, of St. Laurence, for example, is in no way repugnant, even if our commissioners' estimate of the acts from which they are drawn should, after all, be right. As Tillemont somewhere says, "In every legend, however false, there is generally some foundation of truth," and in the case of epics so ancient, so intimately united with a thousand holy associations, so replete with mystic poetry of the happiest and the purest kind, this is all that can be reasonably demanded.

F. E. GILLIAT SMITH.

Bruges, Belgium.

ANALECTA.

EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA LEONIS XIII. DE UNITATE ECCLESIAE.

Venerabilibus Fratribus Patriarchis Primatibus Archiepiscopis Episcopis Aliisque Locorum Ordinariis Pacem et Communionem Cum Apostolica Sede Habentibus.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES

Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

Satis cognitum vobis est, cogitationum et curarum Nostrarum partem non exiguam illuc esse conversam, ut ad *ovile* in potestate positum summi pastoris animarum Jesu Christi revocare devios conemur. Intento hac in re animo, non parum conducere salutari consilio propositoque arbitrati sumus, Ecclesiae effigiem ac velut lineamenta describi: in quibus praecipua consideratione dignissima *unitas* est, quam in ea, velut insigne veritatis invictaeque virtutis, divinus auctor ad perpetuitatem impressit. Multum in intuentium animis nativa Ecclesiae pulchritudo speciesque posse debet: neque abest a veri similitudine, tolli ejus contemplatione posse inscientiam; sanari opiniones falsas praejudicatasque, maxime apud eos qui non sua ipsorum culpa in errore versentur: quin imo excitari etiam in hominibus posse Ecclesiae amorem utique similem caritati, qua Jesus Christus eam sibi sponsam, divino cruore redemptam, optavit: *Christus dilexit Ecclesiam, et se ipsum tradidit pro ea.*[1] Reversuris ad amantissimam parentem, aut non probe cognitam adhuc, aut injuriâ desertam, si reditum stare oporteat non sanguine quidem, quo tamen pretio est Jesu Christo quaesita, sed labore aliquo molestiaque multo ad perpetiendum

1 Ephes. v, 25.

leviore, saltem perspicuum erit non voluntate humana id onus homini, sed jussu nutuque divino impositum, ob eamque rem, opitulante gratia caelesti, facile veritatem experiendo intelligent divinae ejus sententiae: *Jugum enim meum suave est, et onus meum leve.*[1] Quamobrem spe maxima in *Patre luminum* reposita, unde *omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum* descendit,[2] ab eo scilicet, *qui incrememtum dat*[3] unus, enixe petimus, ut Nobis vim persuadendi impertire benigne velit.

Etsi Deus, quaecumque a naturis creatis efficiuntur, omnia ipse efficere sua solius virtute potest, nihilominus tamen ad juvandos homines ipsis uti hominibus, ex benigno providentiae consilio, maluit: et quemadmodum in rerum genere naturalium perfectionem debitam, ita in iis, quae modum naturae transiliunt, sanctitatem homini ac salutem non nisi hominum opera ministerioque impertire consuevit. Sed perspicuum est, nihil inter homines communicari, nisi per externas res quae sensibus percipiantur, posse. Hac de caussa humanam naturam assumpsit Dei Filius, *qui cum in forma Dei esset . . . semetipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, in similitudinem hominum factus;*[4] atque ita, in terris agens, doctrinam suam suarumque praecepta legum hominibus, colloquendo, tradidit.

Cum divinum munus ejus perenne ac perpetuum esse oporteret, idcirco nonnullos ille sibi adjunxit alumnos disciplinae suae, fecitque potestatis suae participes: cumque *Spiritum veritatis* in eos devocasset e caelo, praecepit, peragrarent orbem terrarum, quodque ipse docuerat quodque jusserat, id omne fideliter universitati gentium praedicarent; hoc quidem proposito, ut ejus et professione doctrinae et obtemperatione legibus posset hominum genus sanctitatem in terris, felicitatem adipisci in caelo sempiternam.—Hac ratione atque hoc principio Ecclesia genita: quae quidem, si extremum illud quod vult, caussaeque proximae sanctitatem efficientes spectentur, profecto est *spiritualis;* si vero eos consideres, quibus cohaeret, resque ipsas quae ad spiritualia dona perducunt, *externa* est necessarioque conspicua.

1 Matth. xi, 30. 2 Ep. Jac. i, 17. 3 Corinth. iii, 6. 4 Philippens. ii, 6–7.

Docendi munus accepere Apostoli per cognoscenda visu audituque signa; idque illi munus non aliter executi quam dictis factisque, quae utique sensus permoverent. Ita quidem illorum vox extrinsecus illapsa per aures, fidem ingeneravit in animis; *Fides ex auditu, auditus autem per verbum Christi.*[1] Ac fides ipsa, scilicet assensio primae supremaeque veritati, mente quidem per se comprehenditur, sed tamen eminere foras evidenti professione debet: *Corde enim creditur ad justitiam; ore autem confessio fit ad salutem.*[2] Simili modo nihil est homini gratiâ caelesti, quae gignit sanctitudinem, interius; sed externa sunt ordinaria ac praecipua participandae instrumenta gratiae; sacramenta dicimus, quae ab hominibus ad id nominatim lectis, certorum ope rituum, administrantur. Jussit Jesus Christus Apostolis perpetuisque Apostolorum successoribus, gentes ut edocerent ac regerent; jussit gentibus, ut illorum et doctrinam acciperent et potestati obedienter subessent. Verum isthaec in christiana republica jurium atque officiorum vicissitudo non modo permanere, sed ne incohari quidem potuisset nisi per interpretes ac nuntios rerum sensus.—Quibus de caussis Ecclesiam cum *corpus*, tum etiam *corpus Christi* tam crebro sacrae litterae nominant; *Vos autem estis corpus Christi.*[3] Propter eam rem quod corpus est, oculis cernitur Ecclesia: propterea quod est Christi, vivum corpus est actuosum et vegetum, quia eam tuetur ac sustentat, immissa virtute sua, Jesus Christus, in eum fere modum quo cohaerentes sibi palmites alit ac fructuosos facit vitis. Quemadmodum autem in animantibus principium vitae in occulto est ac penitus abditum, indicatur tamen atque ostenditur motu actuque membrorum, sic in Ecclesia supernaturalis principium vitae perspicue ex iis, quae ab ipsa aguntur, apparet.

Ex quo consequitur, in magno eodemque pernicioso errore versari, qui ad arbitrium suum fingunt Ecclesiam atque informant quasi latentem minimeque conspicuam: item qui perinde habent atque institutum quoddam humanum cum temperatione quadam disciplinae ritibusque externis, at sine perenni communicatione munerum gratiae divinae, sine

1 Roman. x, 17. 2 Ib. 10. 3 I. Corinth. xii, 27.

rebus iis, quae haustam a Deo vitam quotidiana atque aperta significatione testentur. Nimirum alterutram esse posse Iesu Christi Ecclesiam tam repugnat, quam solo corpore, vel anima sola constare hominem. Complexio copulatioque earum duarum velut partium prorsus est ad veram Ecclesiam necessaria, sic fere ut ad naturam humanam intima animae corporisque coniunctio. Non est Ecclesia intermortuum quiddam, sed corpus Christi vita supernaturali praeditum. Sicut Christus, caput ex exemplar, non omnis est, si in eo vel humana dumtaxat spectetur natura visibilis, quod Photiniani ac Nestoriani faciunt; vel divina tantummodo natura invisibilis, quod solent Monophysitae; sed unus est ex utraque et in utraque natura cum visibili tum invisibili; sic corpus eius mysticum non vera Ecclesia est nisi propter eam rem, quod eius partes conspicuae vim vitamque ducunt ex donis supernaturalibus rebusque ceteris, unde propria ipsarum ratio ac natura efflorescit. Cum autem Ecclesia sit *eiusmodi* voluntate et constitutione divina, permanere sine ulla intermissione debet *eiusmodi* in aeternitate temporum; nî permaneret, profecto nec esset condita ad perennitatem, et finis ipse, quo illa contendit, locorum esset temporumque certo spatio definitus; quod cum veritate utrumque pugnat. Istam igitur et visibilium et invisibilium coniunctionem rerum, quia naturalis atque insita in Ecclesia nutu divino inest, tamdiu permanere necesse est, quamdiu ipsa permansura Ecclesia. Quare Chrysostomus: *Ab Ecclesia ne abstineas: nihil enim fortius Ecclesia. Spes tua Ecclesia, salus tua Ecclesia, refugium tuum Ecclesia. Caelo excelsior et terra latior est illa. Numquam senescit, sed semper viget. Quamobrem eius firmitatem stabilitatemque demonstrans, Scriptura montem illam vocat.*[1] Augustinus vero: *Putant* (gentiles) *religionem nominis christiana ad certum tempus in hoc saeculo victuram, et postea non futuram. Permanebit ergo cum sole, quamdiu sol oritur et occidit; hoc est quamdiu tempora ista volvuntur, non deerit Ecclesia Dei, id est Christi corpus in terris.*[2] Idemque alibi: *Nutabit Ecclesia, si nutaverit fundamentum; sed unde nutabit Christus?*

1 Hom *De capto Eutropio*, n. 6 2 *In Psal. lxxi*, n. 8.

. . . *Non nutante Christo, non inclinabitur in saeculum saeculi. Ubi sunt qui dicunt, periisse de mundo Ecclesiam, quando nec inclinari potest?*[1]

His velut fundamentis utendum veritatem quaerenti. Scilicet Ecclesiam instituit formavitque Christus Dominus: propterea natura illius cum quaeritur cuiusmodi sit, caput est nosse quid Christus voluerit quidque reapse effecerit. Ad hanc regulam exigenda maxime Ecclesiae unitas est, de qua visum est, communis utilitatis caussâ, nonnihil his litteris attingere.

Profecto unam esse Iesu Christi germanam Ecclesiam, ex luculento ac multiplici sacrarum litterarum testimonio, sic constat inter omnes, ut contradicere christianus nemo ausit. Verum in diiudicanda statuendaque natura unitatis, multos varius error de via deflectit. Ecclesiae quidem non solum ortus sed tota constitutio ad rerum voluntate libera effectarum pertinet genus; quocirca ad id quod revera gestum est, iudicatio est omnis revocanda, exquirendumque non sane quo pacto una esse Ecclesia queat, sed quo unam esse is voluit, qui condidit.

Iamvero, si ad id respicitur quod gestum est, Ecclesiam Iesus Christus non talem finxit formavitque, quae communitates plures complecteretur genere similes, sed distinctas, neque iis vinculis alligatas, quae Ecclesiam individuam atque unicam efficerent, eo plane modo, quo *Credo unam. . . Ecclesiam* in symbolo fidei profitemur. *In unius naturae sortem cooptatur Ecclesia quae est una, quam conantur haereses in multas discindere. Et essentia ergo et opinione, et principio et excellentia unicam esse dicimus antiquam et catholicam Ecclesiam. . . Ceterum Ecclesiae quoque eminentia, sicut principium constructionis, est ex unitate, omnia alia superans, et nihil habens sibi simile vel aequale.* Sane Iesus Christus de aedificio eiusmodi mystico cum loqueretur, Ecclesiam non commemorat nisi unam, quam appellat *suam; aedificabo Ecclesiam meam.* Quaecumque, praeter hanc, cogitetur alia, cum non sit per Iesum Christum condita,

1 *Enarratio in Psal. ciii*, sermo ii, n. 5.

2 Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromatum* lib. vii, cap. 17.

Ecclesia Christi vera esse non potest. Quod eminet etiam magis, si divini auctoris propositum consideretur. Quid enim in condita condendave Ecclesia petiit, quid voluit Christus Dominus? Hoc scilicet; munus idem, idemque mandatum in eam continuandum transmittere, quod ipse acceperat a Patre. Id plane statuerat faciendum, idque re effecit. *Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos.*[1] *Sicut tu me misisti in mundum, et ego misi eos in mundum.*[2] Iamvero Christi muneris est vindicare ab interitu ad salutem *quod perierat*, hoc est non aliquot gentes aut civitates, sed omnino hominum, nullo locorum temporumve discrimine, universum genus: venit *Filius hominis . . . ut salvetur mundus per ipsum.*[3] *Nec enim aliud nomen est sub caelo datum hominibus, in quo oporteat nos salvos fieri.*[4] Itaque partam per Iesum Christum salutem, simulque beneficia omnia quae inde proficiscuntur, late fundere in omnes homines atque ad omnes propagare aetates debet Ecclesia. Quocirca ex voluntate auctoris sui unicam in omnibus terris, in perpetuitate temporum, esse necesse est. Plane plus una ut esse posset, excedere terris et genus hominum fingere novum atque inauditum oporteret.

Hoc ipsum de Ecclesia una, quotquot esset ubique et quovis tempore mortales complexura, vidit ac praesignificavit Isaias, cum, futura prospicienti, obiecta species montis est, celsitudinis exsuperantia conspicui, qui imaginem *Domus Domini*, videlicet Ecclesiae, expressam gerebat: *Et erit in novissimis diebus praeparatus mons domus Domini in vertice montium.*[5] Atqui *unus* iste mons est, in vertice montium locatus: *una* domus Domini, ad quam *omnes gentes* vivendi normam petiturae aliquando confluerent: *Et fluent ad eam omnes gentes . . . et dicent: venite et ascendamus ad montem Domini, et ad domum Dei Iacob, et docebit nos vias suas, et ambulabimus in semitis eius.*[6] Quem locum cum Optatus Milevitanus attingeret, *Scriptum est*, inquit, *in Isaia propheta: ex Sion prodiet lex, et verbum Domini de Hierusalem. Non ergo in illo monte Sion Isaias aspicit vallem, sed in monte sancto, qui est Ecclesia, qui per omnem orbem romanum caput tulit*

1 Ioan, xx, 21. 2 Ioan, xvii, 18. 3 Ioan, iii, 17.
4 Act. iv, 12. 5 Isaias, ii, 2. 6 Ib. 2-3.

sub toto caelo. . . Est ergo spiritalis Sion Ecclesia, in qua a Deo Patre rex constitutus est Christus, quae est in toto orbe terrarum, in quo est una Ecclesia catholica.[1] Augustinus vero: *Quid tam manifestum quam mons? Sed sunt et montes ignoti, quia in una parte terrarum positi sunt . . . Ille autem mons non sic, quia implevit universam faciem terrae: et de illo dicitur: paratus id cacumine montium.*[2] Illud accedit, quod Ecclesiam Filius Dei mysticum corpus suum decrevit fore, quocum ipse velut caput coniungeretur, ad similitudinem corporis humani quod suscepit; cui quidem naturali conglutinatione inhaeret naturale caput. Sicut igitur mortale corpus sibi sumpsit unicum, quod obtulit ad cruciatus et necem, ut liberationis humanae pretium exsolveret, sic pariter unum habet corpus mysticum, in quo et cuius ipsius operâ facit sanctitatis salutisque aeternae homines compotes: *Ipsum* (Christum) *dedit* (Deus) *caput supra omnem Ecclesiam, quae est corpus ipsius.*[3] Dispersa membra atque seiuncta non possunt eodem cum capite, unum simul effectura corpus, cohaerere. Atqui Paulus, *Omnia autem*, inquit, *membra corporis cum sint multa, unum tamen corpus sunt; ita et Christus.*[4] Propterea corpus istud mysticum *compactum* ait esse *et connexum. Caput Christus: ex quo totum corpus compactum, et connexum per omnem iuncturam subministrationis, secundum operationem in mensuram uniuscuiusque membri.*[5] Quamobrem dispersa a membris ceteris siqua membra vagantur, cum eodem atque unico capite conglutinata esse nequeunt; *Unus Deus est, et Christus unus, et una Ecclesia eius et fides una et plebs una in solidam corporis unitatem concordiae glutino copulata. Scindi unitas non potest, nec corpus unum discidio compaginis separari.*[6] Quo melius Ecclesiam effingat unicam, similitudinem animati corporis informat, cuius non aliter victura membra sunt, nisi colligata cum capite, vim ad se vitalem ex capite ipso traducant; seiuncto, necesse est emori: *Non potest* (Ecclesia) . . . *divulsis laceratione visceribus in frusta discerpi. Quidquid a matrice discesserit, seorsum vivere et spirare non poterit.*[7] Mortuum vero corpus quid habet cum

1 *De Schism. Donatist.*, lib. iii, n. 2. 2 *In Epist. Ioan.* tract. i, n. 13
3 Ephes. i, 22-23. 4 I. Corinth. xii, 12. 5 Ephes. iv, 15-16.
6 S. Cyprianus, *De cath. Eccl. Unitate*, n. 23. 7 Id. loc cit.

vivo similitudinis? *Nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habuit: sed nutrit, et fovet eam, sicut et Christus Ecclesiam: quia membra sumus corporis eius, de carne eius et de ossibus eius.*[1] Aliud igitur simile Christo incohetur caput, alius Christus, si praeter eam, quae corpus eius est, fingi Ecclesiam alteram libeat. *Videte quid caveatis, videte quid observetis, videte quid timeatis. Contingit, ut in corpore humano, imo de corpore aliquod praecidatur membrum, manus, digitus, pes: numquid praecisum sequitur anima? Cum in corpore esset, vivebat: praecisum amittit vitam. Sic et homo christianus catholicus est, dum in corpore vivit: praecisus haereticus factus est: membrum amputatum non sequitur spiritus.*[2] Est igitur Ecclesia Christi unica et perpetua: quicumque seorsum eant, aberrant a voluntate et praescriptione Christi Domini, relictoque salutis itinere, ad interitum digrediuntur. *Quisquis ab Ecclesia segregatus adulterae iungitur, a promissis Ecclesiae separatur, nec perveniet ad Christi praemia qui reliquit Ecclesiam Christi . . . Hanc unitatem qui non tenet, non tenet Dei legem, non tenet Patris et Filii fidem, vitam non tenet et salutem.*[3]

At vero qui unicam condidit, is idem condidit *unam:* videlicet eiusmodi, ut quotquot in ipsa futuri essent, arctissimis vinculis sociati tenerentur, ita prorsus ut unam gentem, unum regnum, corpus unum efficerent: *Unum corpus, et unus spiritus, sicut vocati estis in una spe vocationis vestrae.*[4] Voluntatem hac de re suam Iesus Christus sanxit, propinqua iam morte, augusteque consecravit, ita Patrem adprecatus: *Non pro eis rogo tantum, sed et pro eis, qui credituri sunt per verbum eorum in me . . . ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint . . . ut sint consummati in unum.*[5] Imo tam intime nexam iussit esse in sectatoribus suis unitatem tamque perfectam, ut coniunctionem cum Patre suam ratione aliqua imitaretur: *Rogo . . . ut omnes unum sint, sicut tu, Pater, in me, et ego in te.*[6] Tantae autem inter homines ac tam absolutae concordiae necessarium fundamentum est convenientia coniunctioque mentium: ex quo conspiratio voluntatum atque agendorum similitudo naturâ gignitur.

1 Ephes. v, 29, 30. 2 S. Augustinus, sermo cclxvii, n. 4.
3 S. Cyprianus, *De Cath. Eccl. Unitate*, n. 6. 4 Ephes. iv, 4
5 Ioan. xvii, 20, 21, 23. 6 Ib. 21.

Quamobrem, pro sui divinitate consilii, *unitatem fidei* in Ecclesia sua iussit esse: quae quidem virtus primum est in vinculis iis quae hominem iungunt Deo, et inde nomen *fideles* accepimus. *Unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptisma*:[1] videlicet sicut unus Dominus, et baptisma unum, ita omnium christianorum, qui ubique sunt, unam esse fidem oportet. Itaque Paulus Apostolus christianos, ut idem sentiant omnes, effugiantque opinionum dissidia non rogat tantum, sed flagitat ac plane obsecrat: *Obsecro autem vos, fratres, per nomen Domini nostri Iesu Christi: ut idipsum dicatis omnes, et non sint in vobis schismata: sitis autem perfecti in eodem sensu, et in eadem sententia.*[2] Quae loca sane non indigent interprete; satis enim per se loquuntur ipsa. Ceteroqui unam esse fidem debere, qui se profitentur christianos, vulgo assentiuntur. Illud potius maximi momenti ac prorsus necessarium, in quo multi errore falluntur, internoscere quae sit istius species et forma unitatis. Quod ipsum, ut supra fecimus in caussa simili, non opinatione aut coniectura est, sed scientia rei gestae iudicandum: quaerendo scilicet statuendoque qualem in fide unitatem Iesus Christus esse praeceperit.

Iesu Christi doctrina caelestis, tametsi magnam partem consignata litteris afflatu divino, colligare tamen mentes, permissa hominum ingenio, ipsa non poterat. Erat enim proclive factu ut in varias incideret atque inter se differentes interpretationes: idque non modo propter ipsius vim ac mysteria doctrinae, sed etiam propter humani ingenii varietatem, et perturbationem in studia contraria abeuntium cupiditatum. Ex differentia interpretandi dissimilitudines sentiendi necessitate nascuntur: hinc controversiae, dissidia, contentiones, qualia incumbere in Ecclesiam ipsa vidit proxima originibus aetas. De haereticis illud scribit Irenaeus: *Scripturas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero convertunt.*[3] Atque Augustinus: *Neque enim natae sunt haereses et quaedam dogmata perversitatis illaqueantia animas et in profundum praecipitantia, nisi dum scripturae bonae intelliguntur non bene.*[4] Ad coniugandas igitur mentes, ad effici-

1 Ephes. iv, 5
2 I. Corinth. i, 10.
3 Lib. iii, cap. 12, n. 12.
4 *In Evang. Ioan.* tract. xviii, cap. 5, n. 1.

endam tuendamque concordiam sententiarum, ut ut extarent divinae litterae, omnino erat alio quodam *principio* opus. Id exigit divina sapientia : neque enim Deus unam esse fidem velle potuit, nisi conservandae unitatis rationem quamdam idoneam providisset : quod et sacrae litterae perspicue, ut mox dicturi sumus, significant. Certe infinita Dei potentia nulli est vincta vel adstricta rei, omniaque sibi habet obnoxie, velut instrumenta, parentia. De isto igitur principio externo, dispiciendum, quodnam ex omnibus, quae essent in potestate sua, Christus optarit. Quam ob rem oportet christiani nominis revocare cogitatione primordia.

Divinis testata litteris, eademque vulgo cognita commemoramus. Iesus Christus divinitatem divinamque legationem suam miraculorum virtute comprobat : erudire verbo multitudinem ad caelestia insistit, omninoque iubet ut sibi fides docenti adiungatur, hinc praemiis illinc poenis propositis sempiternis : *Si non facio opera Patris mei, nolite credere mihi.*[1] *Si opera non fecissem in eis, quae nemo alius fecit, peccatum non haberent.*[2] *Si autem facio* (opera), *et si mihi non vultis credere, operibus credite.*[3] Quaecumque praecipit, eâdem omnia auctoritate praecipit : in exigendo mentis assensu nihil excipit, nihil secernit. Eorum igitur qui Iesum audissent, si adipisci salutem vellent, officium fuit non modo doctrinam eius accipere universe, sed tota mente assentiri singulis rebus, quas ipse tradidisset : illud enim repugnat, fidem vel una in re non adhiberi Deo.

Maturo in caelum reditu, qua ipse potestate missus a Patre fuerat, eâdem mittit Apostolos, quos spargere ac disseminare iubet doctrinam suam : *Data est mihi omnis potestas in caelo et in terra. Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes . . . Docentes eos servare omnia, quaecumque mandavi vobis.*[4] Salvas fore, qui Apostolis paruissent, qui non paruissent, interituros : *Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit : qui vero non crediderit, condemnabitur.*[5] Cumque illud sit providentiae Dei maxime congruens, ut muneri praesertim magno atque excellenti praeficiat neminem, quin pariter suppeditet unde liceat

1 Ioan. x, 37. 2 Ioan. xv, 24. 3 Ioan. x, 38.
4 Matt. xxviii, 18-19-20. 5 Marc. xvi, 16.

rite defungi, idcirco Iesus Christus missurum se ad discipulos suos Spiritum veritatis pollicitus est, eumque in ipsis perpetuo mansurum: *Si autem abiero, mittam eum* (Paraclitum) *ad vos . . . Cum autem venerit ille Spiritus veritatis, docebit vos omnem veritatem,*[1] *Et ego rogabo Patrem, et alium Paraclitum dabit vobis, ut maneat vobiscum in aeternum, Spiritum veritatis.*[2] . . . *Ille testimonium perhibebit de me: et vos testimonium perhibebitis.*[3] Hinc doctrinam Apostolorum religiose accipi sancteque servari perinde imperat ac suam: *Qui vos audit, me audit: qui vos spernit, me spernit.*[4] Quamobrem legati Apostoli a Iesu Christo sunt non secus ad ipse legatus a Patre: *Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos*:[5] propterea quemadmodum dicto audientes Christo esse Apostolos ac discipulos oportuit, ita pariter fidem adhibere Apostolis debuerant, quoscumque ipsi ex mandato divino docuissent. Ergo Apostolorum vel unum repudiare doctrinae praeceptum plane non plus licuit, quam de ipsius Christi doctrina reiecisse quicquam.—Sane Apostolorum vox, illapso in eos Spiritu sancto, quam latissime insonuit. Quacumque vestigium posuissent, perhibent se ab ipso Iesu legatos. *Per quem* (Iesum Christum) *accepimus gratiam, et apostolatum ad obediendum fidei in omnibus gentibus pro nomine eius:*[6] divinamque eorum legationem passim Deus per prodigia in aperto ponit: *Illi autem profecti praedicaverunt ubique, Domino cooperante, et sermonem confirmante, sequentibus signis.*[7] Quem vero sermonem? eum utique, qui id omne comprehenderet, quod ipsi ex magistro didicissent: palam enim aperteque testantur, nihil se eorum posse, quae viderant quaeque audierant, non loqui.

Sed, quod alio loco diximus, non erat eiusmodi munus apostolicum, ut aut cum personis Apostolorum interire posset, aut cum tempore labi, quippe quod et publicum esset et saluti generis humani institutum. Apostolis enim mandavit Iesus Christus ut praedicarent *evangelium omni creaturae*, et *portarent nomen ipsius coram gentibus et regibus*, et *ut sibi testes essent usque ad ultimum terrae.* Atque in tanti

1 Ioan. xvi, 7–13. 2 Ioan. xiv, 16–17. 3 Ioan. xv, 26–27.
4 Luc. x, 16. 5 Ioan. xx, 21. 6 Rom. i, 5. 7 Marc. xvi, 20.

perfunctione muneris adfore se pollicitus eis est, idque non ad aliquot vel annos vel aetates, sed in omne tempus, *usque ad consummationem saeculi.* Quam ad rem Hieronymus: *Qui usque ad consummationem saeculi cum discipulis se futurum esse promittit, et illos ostendit semper esse victuros et se numquam a credentibus recessurum.*[1] Quae quidem omnia in solis Apostolis, supremae necessitati ex humana conditione obnoxiis, qui vera esse potuissent? Erat igitur provisum divinitus ut magisterium a Iesu Christo institutum non iisdem finibus, quibus vita Apostolorum, terminaretur, sed esset perpetuo mansurum. Propagatum revera ac velut in manus de manu traditum videmus. Nam consecravere episcopos Apostoli, quique sibi proxime succederent in *ministerio verbi*, singillatim designavere.—Neque hoc tantum: illud quoque sanxere in successoribus suis, ut et ipsi viros idoneos adlegerent, quos, eadem auctoritate auctos, eidem praeficerent docendi officio et muneri: *Tu ergo, fili mi, confortare in gratia, quae est in Christo Jesu; et quae audisti a me per multos testes, haec commenda fidelibus hominibus, qui idonei erunt et alios docere.*[2] Qua de caussa sicut Christus a Deo, et Apostoli a Christo, sic episcopi et quotquot Apostolis successere, missi ab Apostolis sunt: *Apostoli nobis Evangelii praedicatores facti sunt a Domino Jesu Christo missus est a Deo. Christus igitur a Deo, et Apostoli a Christo, et factum est utrumque ordinatim ex voluntate Dei. . . . Per regiones igitur et urbes verbum praedicantes, primitias earum spiritu cum probassent, constituerunt episcopos et diaconos eorum qui crediturі erant. . . . Constituerunt praedictos, et deinceps ordinationem dederunt, ut quam illi decessissent, ministerium eorum alii viri probati exciperent.*[3] Permanere igitur necesse est ex una parte constans atque immutabile munus docendi omnia, quae Christus docuerat: ex altera constans atque immutabile officium accipiendi profitendique omnem illorum doctrinam. Quod praeclare Cyprianus iis verbis illustrat: *Neque enim Dominus noster Iesus Christus, cum in Evangelio suo testaretur inimicos suos esse eos, qui secum non*

1 *In Math.* lib. iv. cap, 28, v. 20. 2 II. Tim. ii, 1–2.
3 S. Clemens Rom. Epist. i ad Corinth. capp. 42, 44.

essent, aliquam speciem haereseos designavit: sed omnes omnino qui secum non essent et secum non colligentes, gregem suum spargerent, adversarios esse ostendit, dicens: Qui non est mecum adversus me est: et qui non mecum colligit, spargit.[1]

His Ecclesia praeceptis instituta, sui memor officii, nihil egit studio et contentione maiore, quam ut integritatem fidei omni ex parte tueretur. Hinc perduellium habere loco et procul amandare a se, qui de quolibet doctrinae suae capite non secum una sentirent. Ariani, Montanistae, Novatiani, Quartadecumani, Eutychiani certe doctrinam catholicam non penitus omnem, sed partem aliquam deseruerant: haereticos tamen declaratos, eiectosque ex Ecclesiae sinu quis ignorat fuisse? Similique iudicio damnati, quotquot pravorum dogmatum auctores variis temporibus postea consecuti sunt. *Nihil periculosius his haereticis esse potest, qui cum integre per omnia decurrant, uno tamen verbo, ac si veneni gutta, meram illam ac simplicem fidem Dominicae et exinde apostolicae traditionis inficiunt.*[2] Idem semper Ecclesiae mos, idque sanctorum Patrum consentiente iudicio: qui scilicet communionis catholicae expertem et ab Ecclesia extorrem habere consueverunt, quicumque a doctrina, authentico magisterio proposita, vel minimum discessisset. Epiphanius, Augustinus, Theodoretus haereseon sui quisque temporis magnum recensuere numerum. Alia Augustinus animadvertit posse genera invalescere, quorum vel uni si quis assentiatur, hoc ipso ab unitate catholica seiungitur: *Non omnis, qui ista* (numeratas videlicet haereses) *non credit, consequenter debet se christianum catholicum iam putare vel dicere. Possunt enim et haereses aliae, quae in hoc opere nostro commemoratae non sunt, vel esse vel fieri, quarum aliquam quisquis tenuerit, christianus catholicus non erit.*[3]

Istam tutandae unitati, de qua dicimus, institutam divinitus rationem urget beatus Paulus in epistola ad Ephesios; ubi primum monet, animorum concordiam magno studio conservandam: *solliciti servare unitatem spiritus in vinculo pacis:*[4] cumque concordes animi caritate esse omni ex parte non possint, nisi mentes de fide consentiant, unam apud

1 Epist. lxix. ad Magnum, n. 1.
2 Auctor *Tractatus de Fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos.*
3 *De Haeresibus*, n. 88. 4 iv, 3 et seqq.

omnes vult esse fidem: *Unus Dominus, una fides:* ac tam perfecte quidem unam, ut errandi discrimen omne prohibeat: *Ut iam non simus parvuli fluctuantes, et circumferamur omni vento doctrinae in nequitia hominum, in astutia ad circumventionem erroris.* Idque non ad tempus servari docet oportere, sed *donec occurramus omnes in unitatem fidei . . . in mensuram aetatis plenitudinis Christi.* Sed eiusmodi unitatis ubinam Iesus Christus posuit principium inchoandae, praesidium custodiendae? In eo videlicet, quod, *Ipse dedit quosdam quidem Apostolos . . . alios autem pastores, et doctores, ad consummationem sanctorum in opus ministerii, in aedificationem corporis Christi.* Quare vel inde ab ultima vetustate hanc ipsam regulam doctores Patresque et sequi consueverunt et uno ore defendere. Origenes: *Quoties autem* (haeretici) *canonicas proferunt scripturas, in quibus omnis christianus consentit et credit, videntur dicere: ecce in domibus verbum est veritatis. Sed nos illis credere non debemus, nec exire a prima et ecclesiastica traditione, nec aliter credere, nisi quemadmodum per successionem Ecclesiae Dei tradiderunt nobis.*[1] Irenaeus: *Agnitio vera est Apostolorum doctrina . . . secundum successiones episcoporum . . . quae pervenit usque ad nos custoditione sine fictione scripturarum tractatio plenissima.*[2] Tertullianus vero: *Constat proinde, omnem doctrinam, quae cum illis Ecclesiis apostolicis matricibus et originalibus fidei conspiret, veritati deputandam, sine dubio tenentem quod Ecclesiae ab Apostolis, Apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo accepit . . . Communicamus cum Ecclesiis apostolicis, quod nulli doctrina diversa: hoc est testimonium veritatis.*[3] Atque Hilarius: *Significat* (Christus e navi docens) *eos, qui extra Ecclesiam positi sunt, nullam divini sermonis capere posse intelligentiam. Navis enim Ecclesiae typum praefert, intra quam verbum vitae positum et praedicatum hi qui extra sunt et arenae modo steriles atque inutiles adiacent, intelligere non possunt.*[4] Rufinus Gregorium Nazianzenum laudat et Basilium, quod *solis divinae scripturae voluminibus operam dabant, earumque intelligentiam non ex propria praesumptione, sed ex maiorum scriptis et*

1 *Vetus Interpretatio Commentariorum in Matth.*, n. 46.
2 *Contra Haereses*, lib. iv, cap. 33, n. 8.
3 *De Praescrip.* cap. xxi. 4 *Comment. in Matth.* xiii, n. 1.

auctoritate sequebantur, quos et ipsos ex apostolica successione intelligendi regulam suscepisse constabat.[1]

Quamobrem, id quod ex iis, quae dicta sunt, apparet, instituit Iesus Christus in Ecclesia *vivum*, *authenticum*, idemque *perenne magisterium*, quod suapte potestate auxit, spiritu veritatis instruxit, miraculis confirmavit: eiusque praecepta doctrinae aeque accipi ac sua voluit gravissimeque imperavit. —Quoties igitur huius verbo magisterii edicitur, traditae divinitus doctrinae complexu hoc contineri vel illud, id quisque debet certo credere, verum esse: si falsum esse ullo modo posset, illud consequatur, quod aperte repugnat, erroris in homine ipsum esse auctorem Deum: *Domine, si error est, a te decepti sumus.*[2] Ita omni amota dubitandi caussâ, ullamne ex iis veritatibus potest cuiquam fas esse respuere, quin se det hoc ipso praecipitem in apertam haeresim? quin, seiunctus ab Ecclesia, doctrinam christianam una complexione repudiet universam? Ea quippe est natura fidei, ut nihil tam repugnet quam ista credere, illa reiicere. Fidem enim Ecclesia profitetur esse *virtutem supernaturalem, qua, Dei adiuvante et aspirante gratia, ab eo revelata vera esse credimus, non propter intrinsecam rerum veritatem naturali rationis lumine perspectam, sed propter auctoritatem ipsius Dei revelantis, qui nec falli nec fallere potest.*[3] Si quid igitur traditum a Deo liqueat fuisse, nec tamen creditur, nihil omnino fide divina creditur. Quod enim Iacobus Apostolus de delicto iudicat in genere morum, idem de opinionis errore in genere fidei iudicandum: *Quicumque . . . offendat . . . in uno, factus est omnium reus:*[4] imo de opinionis errore, multo magis. Omnis enim violata lex minus proprie de eo dicitur qui unum peccavit, propterea quod maiestatem Dei legum latoris sprevisse, non nisi interpretanda voluntate, videri potest. Contra is, qui veritatibus divinitus acceptis vel uno in capite dissentiat, verissime fidem exuit funditus, quippe qui Deum, quatenus summa veritas est et *proprium motivum fidei*, recusat vereri: *In multis mecum, in paucis non mecum: sed in his paucis, in quibus non me-*

1 *Hist. Eccl.* lib., ii, cap. 9.
2 Richardus de S. Victore, *De Trin.*, lib. i, cap. 2.
3 Conc. Vat. sess. iii, cap. 3. 4 ii, 10.

cum, non eis prosunt multa, in quibus mecum.[1] Ac sane merito: qui enim sumunt de doctrina christiana, quod malunt, ii iudicio suo nituntur, non fide: iidemque minime *in captivitatem redigentes omnem intellectum in obsequium Christi,*[2] sibimetipsis verius obtemperant, quam Deo: *Qui in Evangelio quod vultis, creditis; quod vultis, non creditis, vobis potius quam Evangelio creditis.*[3]

Quocirca nihil Patres in Concilio Vaticano condidere novi, sed institutum divinum, veterem atque constantem Ecclesiae doctrinam, ipsamque fidei naturam sequuti sunt, cum illud decrevere: *Fide divina et catholica ea omnia credenda sunt, quae in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur, et ab Ecclesia sive solemni iudicio, sive ordinario et universali magisterio tamquam divinitus revelata proponuntur.*[4] Itaque cum appareat, omnino in Ecclesia sua velle Deum unitatem fidei, compertumque sit cuiusmodi eam esse, et quo principio tuendam ipse iusserit, liceat Nobis, quotquot sunt qui non animum induxerint aures veritati claudere, iis Augustini verbis affari: *Cum igitur tantum auxilium Dei, tantum profectum fructumque videamus, dubitabimus nos eius Ecclesiae condere gremio, quae usque ad confessionem generis humani ab apostolica Sede per successiones episcoporum, frustra haereticis circumlatrantibus, et partim plebis ipsius iudicio, partim Conciliorum gravitate, partim etiam miraculorum maiestate damnatis, culmen auctoritatis obtinuit? Cui nolle primas dare, vel summae profecto impietatis est, vel praecipitis arrogantiae. . . . Et si unaquaeque disciplina, quamquam vilis et facilis, ut percipi possit, doctorem aut magistrum requirit: quid temerariae superbiae plenius, quam divinorum sacramentorum libros et ab interpretibus suis nolle cognoscere, et incognitos velle damnare?*[5]

Hoc igitur sine ulla dubitatione est officium Ecclesiae, christianam doctrinam tueri eamque propagare integram atque incorruptam. Sed nequaquam in isto sunt omnia: imo ne finis quidem, cuius caussâ est Ecclesia instituta, officio isto concluditur. Quandoquidem, ut Iesus Christus pro salute humani generis se ipse devovit, atque huc, quae

1 S Augustinus, *in Psal. liv*, n. 10. 2 II. Corinth. x, 5.
3 S. Augustinus, lib. xvii. *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, cap. 3.
4 Sess. iii, cap. 3. 5 *De Utilitate Credendi*, cap. xvii, n. 35.

docuisset quaeque praecepisset, omnia retulit, sic iussit Ecclesiam quaerere in veritate doctrinae, quo homines cum sanctos efficeret, tum salvos.—Verum tanti magnitudinem atque excellentiam propositi consequi sola fides nullo modo potest: adhiberi necesse est cum Dei cultum iustum ac pium, qui maxime sacrificio divina et sacramentorum communicatione continetur, tum etiam sanctitatem legum ac disciplinae.—Ista igitur omnia inesse in Ecclesia oportet, quippe quae Servatoris munia in aevum persequitur: religionem, quam in ea velut *incorporari* ille voluit, mortalium generi omni ex parte absolutam sola praestat: itemque ea, quae ex ordinario providentiae consilio sunt instrumenta salutis, sola suppeditat.

At vero quo modo doctrina caelestis nunquam fuit privatorum arbitrio ingeniove permissa, sed principio a Iesu tradita, deinceps ei separatim, de quo dictum est, commendata magisterio: sic etiam non singulis e populo christiano, verum delictis quibusdam data divinitus facultas est perficiendi atque administrandi divina mysteria, unâ cum regendi gubernandique potestate. Neque enim nisi ad Apostolos legitimosque eorum successores ea pertinent a Iesu Christo dicta: *Euntes in mundum universum, praedicate Evangelium . . . baptizantes eos. . . Hoc facite in meam commemorationem. . . Quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis.* Similique ratione non nisi Apostolis, quique eis iure successissent, mandavit ut *pascerent*, hoc est cum potestate regerent universitatem christianorum, quos hoc ipso eis subesse debere atque obtemperare et consequens. Quae quidem officia apostolici muneris omnia generatim Pauli sententia complectitur: *Sic nos existimet homo ut ministros Christi, et dispensatores mysteriorum Dei.*[1]

Quapropter mortales Iesus Christus, quotquot essent, et quotquot essent futuri, universos advocavit, ut ducem se eumdemque servatorem sequerentur, non tantum seorsum singuli, sed etiam consociati atque invicem re animisque iuncti, ut ex multitudine populus existeret iure sociatus; fidei, finis, rerum ad finem idonearum communione unus,

1 I. Corinth. iv, 1.

uni eidemque subiectus potestati. Quo ipse facto principia naturae, quae in hominibus societatem sponte gignunt, perfectionem naturae consentaneam adepturis, omnia in Ecclesia posuit, nimirum ut in ea, quotquot filii Dei esse adoptione volunt, perfectionem dignitati suae congruentem assequi et retinere ad salutem possent. Ecclesia igitur, id quod alias attigimus, dux hominibus est ad caelestia, eidemque hoc est munus assignatum a Deo ut de iis, quae religionem attingunt, videat ipsa et statuat, et rem christianam libere expediteque iudicio suo administret. Quocirca Ecclesiam aut non recte norunt aut inique criminantur qui eam insimulant, velle se in civitatum rationes, inferre, aut in iura potentatus invadere. Imo Deus perfecit, ut Ecclesia esset omnium societatum longe praestantissima : nam quod petit ipsa tanquam finem, tanto nobilius est quam quod ceterae petunt societates, quanto naturâ gratia divina, rebusque caducis immortalia sunt praestabiliora bona.—Ergo Ecclesia societas est ortu *divina :* fine, rebusque fini proxime admoventibus, *supernaturalis :* quod vero coalescit hominibus, *humana* communitas est. Ideoque in sacris litteris passim videmus vocabulis societatis perfectae nuncupatam. Nominatur enim non modo *Domus Dei, Civitas supra montem posita,* quo convenire gentes omnes necesse est : sed etiam *Ovile,* cui praesit pastor unus, et quo recipere se oves Christi omnes debent : imo *Regnum quod suscitavit Deus,* quodque *stabit in aeternum :* denique *Corpus* Christi, *mysticum* illud quidem, sed tamen vivum apteque compositum, multisque conflatum membris : quae membra non eumdem actum habent : copulata vero inter se, gubernante ac moderante capite continentur. Iamvero nulla hominum cogitari potest vera ac perfecta societas, quin potestate aliqua summa regatur. Debet igitur Iesus Christus magistratum Ecclesiae maximum praefecisse, cui obediens ac subiecta omnis esset christianorum multitudo. Qua de caussa sicut ad unitatem Ecclesiae, quatenus est *coetus fidelium,* necessario unitas fidei requiritur, ita ad ipsius unitatem, quatenus est divinitus constituta societas, requiritur iure divino *unitas regiminis,* quae *unitatem communionis* efficit et complectitur : *Ecclesiae*

autem unitas in duobus attenditur: scilicet in connexione membrorum Ecclesiae ad invicem seu communicatione, et iterum in ordine omnium membrorum Ecclesiae ad unum caput.[1]—Ex quo intelligi licet, excidere homines ab Ecclesiae unitate non minus schismate, quam haeresi: *Inter haeresim et schisma hoc esse arbitraniur, quod haeresis perversum dogma habeat: schisma propter episcopalem dissensionem ab Ecclesia separetur.*[2] Quibuscum illa Ioannis Chrysostomi in eamdem rem sententia concordat: *Dico et protestor, Ecclesiam scindere non minus esse malum, quam incidere in haeresim.*[3] Quamobrem si nulla potest esse honesta haeresis, pari ratione schisma nullum est, quod possit iure factum videri: *Non est quicquam gravius sacrilegio schismatis . . . praecidendae unitatis nulla est iusta necessitas.*[4]

Quae vero et cuiusmodi summa ista potestas sit, cui christianos parere oportet universos, non aliter nisi comperta cognitaque voluntate Christi statuendum. Certe in aeternum rex Christus est, itemque moderari in aeternum tuerique regnum suum e caelo non visus perseverat: sed quia conspicuum illud esse voluit, designare debuit qui gereret in terris vices suas, postea quam ipse ad caelestia rediisset: *Si quis autem dicat quod unum caput et unus pastor est Christus, qui est unus unius Ecclesiae sponsus, non sufficienter respondet. Manifestum est enim, quod ecclesiastica sacramenta ipse Christus perficit: ipse enim est qui baptizat, ipse est qui peccata remittit, ipse est verus sacerdos, qui se obtulit in ara crucis, et cuius virtute corpus eius in altari quotidie consecratur; et tamen quia corporaliter non cum omnibus fidelibus praesentialiter erat futurus, elegit ministros, per quos praedicta fidelibus dispensaret, ut supra (cap. 74) dictum est. Eadem igitur ratione, quia praesentiam corporalem erat Ecclesiae subtracturus, oportuit ut alicui committeret qui loco sui universalis Ecclesiae gereret curam. Hinc est quod Petro dixit ante ascensionem: Pasce oves meas.*[5] Iesus Christus igitur summum rectorem Ecclesiae Petrum dedit, idemque sanxit ut eiusmodi magistratus saluti communi ad perennitatem institutus, ad

1 S. Thomas, 2ª 2ae, q. xxxix, a. 1.
2 S. Hieronymus, *Commentar. in Epist. ad Titum*, cap. iii, v. 10, 11.
3 Hom. xi *in Epist ad Ephes.*, n. 5
4 S. Augustinus, *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, lib. ii, cap. 11, n. 25.
5 S.Thomas, *Contra Gentiles* lib. iv, cap. 76.

successores hereditate transferretur, in quibus Petrus ipse esset auctoritate perpetua superstes. Sane insigne illud promissum beato Petro fecit, praeterea nemini : *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam.*[1]—*Ad Petrum locutus est Dominus : ad unum, ideo ut unitatem fundaret ex uno.*[2]—*Nulla siquidem oratione praemissa... tam patrem eius, quam ipsum nomine appellat* (beatus es Simon Bar Iona), *et Simonem eum non iam vocari patitur, eum sibi pro sua potestate iam tum ut suum vindicans, sed congrua similitudine Petrum a petra vocari placuit, puta super quem fundaturus erat suam Ecclesiam.*[3] Quo ex oraculo liquet, Dei voluntate issuque Ecclesiam in beato Petro, velut aedes in fundamento consistere. Atqui fundamenti propria natura et vis est, ut cohaerentes efficiat aedes variorum coagmentatione membrorum, itemque ut operi sit necessarium vinculum incolumitatis ac firmitudinis : quo sublato, omnis aedificatio collabitur. Igitur Petri est sustinere Ecclesiam tuerique non solubili compage connexam ac firmam. Tantum vero explere munus qui possit sine potestate iubendi, vetandi, iudicandi, quae vere proprieque *iurisdictio* dicitur ? Profecto non nisi potestate iurisdictionis stant civitates resque publicae. Principatus honoris ac pertenuis illa consulendi monendique facultas, quam *directionem* vocant, nulli hominum societati admodum prodesse neque ad unitatem neque ad firmitudinem queunt. Atque hanc, de qua loquimur, potestatem illa declarant et confirmant : *Et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam.—Quam autem eam? an enim petram supra quam Christus aedificat Ecclesiam ? an Ecclesiam ? Ambigua quippe locutio est : an quasi unam eamdemque rem, petram et Ecclesiam ? Hoc ego verum esse existimo, nec enim adversus petram, super quam Christus Ecclesiam aedificat, nec adversus Ecclesiam portae inferi praevalebunt.*[4] Cuiis divinae sententiae ea vis est : quamcumque visi invisique hostes vim, quascumque artes adhibuerint, numquam fore ut fulta Petro Ecclesia succumbat, aut quoquo modo deficiat : *Ecclesia vero tamquam Christi aedificium, qui sapienter aedifi-*

1 Matth. xvi, 18. 2 S. Pacianus, ad Sempronium, epist. iii, n. 11.
3 S. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *in Evang. Ioan.* lib. ii, in cap. i, v. 42.
4 Origenes, *Comment. in Matth.*, tom. xii, n. 11.

cavit "domum suam supra petram," portarum inferi, capax non est, praevalentium quidem adversus quemcumque hominem, qui extra petram et Ecclesiam fuerit, sed invalidarum adversus illam.[1] Ergo Ecclesiam suam Deus idcirco commendavit Petro, ut perpetuo incolumem tutor invictus conservaret. Eum igitur auxit potestate debita: quia societati hominum re et cum effectu tuendae, ius imperii in eo qui tuetur est necessarium. Illud praeterea Iesus adnexuit: *Et tibi dabo claves regni caelorum.* Plane loqui de Ecclesia pergit, quam paullo ante nuncuparat *suam*, quamque ipsam velle se in Petro dixit, tamquam in fundamento, statuere. Expressam non modo *aedificii*, sed etiam *regni* imaginem gerit Ecclesia: ceteroqui insigne usitatum imperii claves esse, nemo nescit. Quapropter *claves regni caelorum* cum Iesus dare Petro pollicetur, potestatem et ius in Ecclesiam pollicetur daturum: *Filius vero et Patris et sui ipsius cognitionem per totum orbem illi (Petro) disseminare commisit, ac mortali homini omnem in caelo potestatem dedit, dum claves illi tradidit, qui Ecclesiam per totum orbem terrarum extendit, et caelis firmiorem monstravit.*[2] Concinunt cetera: *Quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in caelis, et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in caelis.* Ligandi solvendique translata locutio ius ferendarum legum, item iudicandi vindicandique designat potestatem. Quae quidem potestas tantae amplitudinis virtutisque dicitur fore, ut quaelibet decreta eius rata sit habiturus Deus. Itaque summa est planeque sui iuris, quippe quae nullam habet in terris superiorem gradu, Ecclesiamque totam et quae sunt Ecclesiae commissa, universa complectitur.

Promissum exsolvitur, quo tempore Christus Dominus, post anastasim suam, cum ter a Petro, num se diligeret plus quam ceteri, quaesisset, praecipientis in modum ei, *Pasce*, ait, *agnos meos . . . pasce oves meas.*[3] Nimirum quotquot essent in ovili suo futuri, omnes illi velut pastori committit: *Dominus non dubitat, qui interrogat, non ut disceret, sed ut doceret, quem elevandus in caelum amoris sui nobis velut vicarium relin-*

1 Origenes, *Comment. in Math.*, tom. xii, n. 11.
2. S. Ioannes Chrysostomus, Hom. liv, *in Matth.*, n. 2.
3 Ioan. xxi, 16, 17.

quebat. . . . Et ideo quia solus profitetur ex omnibus, omnibus antefertur . . . perfectiores ut perfectior gubernaret.[1] Illa vero sunt pastoris officia et partes, gregi se praebere ducem, eumdemque sospitare salubritate pabulorum, prohibendo pericula, cavendo insidias, tutando a vi; brevi, regendo gubernando. Cum igitur Petrus est gregi christianorum pastor impositus, potestatem accepit gubernandi omnes homines, quorum saluti Iesus Christus profuso sanguine prospexerat: *Cur sanguinem effudit? Ut has emeret oves, quas Petro et successoribus eius tradidit.*[2]

Quoniamque immutabilis communione fidei christianos omnes oportet esse invicem coniunctos, idcirco suarum virtute precum Christus Dominus impetravit Petro, ut in gerenda potestate numquam fide laberetur: *Ego autem rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua.*[3] Eidem praeterea mandavit ut, quoties tempora postularent, ipse impertiret fratribus suis lumen animi et robur: *Confirma fratres tuos.*[4] Quem igitur fundamentum Ecclesiae designarat, eumdem esse vult columen fidei: *Cui propria auctoritate regnum dabat, huius fidem firmare non poterat, quem cum petram dicit, firmamentum Ecclesiae indicavit?*[5] Hinc ipse Iesus certa quaedam nomina, magnarum, indicia rerum, quae *sibi potestate sunt propria, voluit esse Petro secum participatione communia,*[6] nimirum ut ex communione titulorum appareret communio potestatis. Ita ipse, qui *lapis est angularis, in quo omnis aedificatio constructa crescit in templum sanctum in Domino.*[7] Petrum velut *lapidem* statuit, quo fulta esse Ecclesia deberet. *Cum audisset, "petra es" praeconio nobilitatus est. Quamquam autem petra est, non ut Christus petra, sed ut Petrus petra. Christus enim essentialiter petra inconcussa; Petrus vero per petram. Nam Iesus dignitates suas largitur, nec exhauritur. . . . Sacerdos est, facit sacerdotes . . . petra est, petram facit.*[8] Rex idem Ecclesiae, *qui habet clavem David: qui aperit et nemo claudit: claudit et nemo aperit,*[9] traditis Petro *clavibus*, principem christianae reipub-

1 S. Ambrosius, *Exposit. in Evang. secundum Lucam*, lib. x, nn. 175, 176.
2 S. Ioannes Chrysostomus, *De Sacerdotio*, lib. ii.
3 Luc. xxii, 32. 4 Ib. 5 S. Ambrosius, *De Fide*, lib. iv, n. 56.
6 S. Leo M. sermo iv, cap. 2. 7 Ephes ii, 21.
8 Hom. *de Poenitentia*, n. 4 in appendice opp. S. Basilii. 9 Apoc. iii, 7.

licae declaravit. Pariter pastor maximus, qui se ipse *pastorem bonum* nuncupat,[1] *agnis atque ovibus suis* pastorem Petrum praeposuit: *Pasce agnos, pasce oves.* Quare Chrysostomus: *Eximius erat inter Apostolos, et os discipulorum et coetus illius caput. . . . Simul ostendens ei, oportere deinceps fidere, quasi abolita negatione, fratrum ei praefecturam committit. . . . Dicit autem: Si amas me, fratribus praeesto.*[2] Demum qui confirmat *in omni opere et sermone bono*,[3] mandavit Petro ut *confirmaret fratres suos.* Iure igitur Leo magnus: *De toto mundo unus Petrus eligitur, qui et universarum gentium vocationi et omnibus Apostolis, cunctisque Ecclesiae patribus praeponatur: ut quamvis in populo Dei multi sacerdotes sint multique pastores, omnes tamen proprie regat Petrus, quos principaliter regit et Christus.*[4] Itemque Gregorius magnus ad Imperatorem Mauritium Augustum: *Cunctis evangelium scientibus liquet, quod voce dominica sancto et omnium Apostolorum Petro principi apostolo totius Ecclesiae cura commissa est. . . . Ecce claves regni caelestis accepit, potestas ei ligandi ac solvendi tribuitur, et cura ei totius Ecclesiae et principatus committitur.*[5]

Eiusmodi autem principatum, quoniam constitutione ipsa temperationeque Ecclesiae, velut pars praecipua, continetur, videlicet ut principium unitatis ac fundamentum incolumitatis perpetuae, nequaquam cum beato Petro interire, sed recidere in eius successores ex alio in alium oportuit: *Manet ergo dispositio veritatis, et beatus Petrus in accepta fortitudine petrae perseverans, suscepta Ecclesiae gubernacula non reliquit.*[6] Quare Pontifices, qui Petro in episcopatu romano succedunt, supremam Ecclesiae potestatem obtinent iure divino. *Definimus, sanctam Apostolicam Sedem et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri, principis Apostolorum, et verum Christi vicarium totiusque Ecclesiae caput, et omnium christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere, et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac guber-*

1 Ioan. x, 11.
2 Hom. lxxxviii. *in Ioan.* n. 1.
3 II. Thessalon ii, 16.
4 Sermo iv, cap. 2.
5 *Epistolarum*, lib. v, epist. xx.
6 S. Leo M. sermo iii, cap. 4.

nandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Iesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse; quemadmodum etiam in gestis oecumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur.[1] Similiter Concilium Lateranense IV: *Romana Ecclesia . . . disponente Domino, super omnes alias ordinariae potestatis obtinet principatum, utpote mater universorum Christifidelium et magistra.* Antecesserat consensus antiquitatis, quae episcopos romanos sine ulla dubitatione sic semper observavit et coluit ut beati Petri legitimos successores. Quem vero lateat quot in eamdem rem extent et quam luculenta sanctorum patrum testimonia? Illud valde praeclarum Irenaei qui cum de Ecclesiae romana dissereret, *ad hanc enim*, inquit, *Ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam.*[2] Ac Cyprianus itidem de Ecclesia romana affirmat, eam esse *Ecclesiae catholicae radicem et matricem*,[3] *Petri Cathedram atque Ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est.*[4] *Cathedram* Petri appellat quippe quam insidet Petri successor: *Ecclesiam principalem* ob principatum Petro ipsi et legitimis successoribus collatum: *unde unitas exorta*, quia in christiana republica caussa efficiens unitatis est Ecclesia romana. Quare Hieronymus iis verbis Damasum affatur: *Cum successore piscatoris et discipulo crucis loquor. . . . Beatitudini tuae, id est Cathedrae Petri communione consocior. Super illam petram aedificatam Ecclesiam scio.*[5] Sollemne illi est, catholicum hominem ex coniunctione cum romana Petri sede internoscere: *Si quis Cathedrae Petri iungitur, meus est.*[6] Neque absimili ratione Augustinus, palam testatus, *in romana Ecclesia semper Apostolicae cathedrae viguisse principatum*,[7] negat esse catholicum, quicumque a fide romana dissentiat: *Non crederis veram fidem tenere catholicam, qui fidem non doces esse servandam romanam.*[8] Item Cyprianus: Communicare cum Cornelio, *hoc est cum catholica Ecclesia communicare.*[9] Similiter Maximus

1 *Concilium Florentinum.* 2 *Contra Haereses.* lib. iii, cap. 3, n. 2.
3 Epist. xlviii, ad Cornelium, n. 3. 14 Epist. lix, ad eumd., n. 14.
5 Epist. xv, ad Damasum, n 2. 6 Epist. xvi, ad Damasum, n. 2.
7 Epist. xliii, n. 7. 8 Sermo cxx, n. 13. 9 Epist. lv, n 1.

Abbas hanc verae fidei veraeque communionis notam esse docet, subesse Pontifici romano: *Itaque si vult haereticus non esse neque audire, non isti aut illi satisfaciat. . . . Festinet pro omnibus sedi romanae satisfacere. Hac enim satisfacta, communiter ubique omnes pium hunc et orthodoxum praedicabunt. Nam frustra solummodo loquitur, qui mihi similes suadendos putat, et non satisfacit et implorat sanctissimae Romanorum Ecclesiae beatissimum Papam, id est Apostolicam Sedem.* Cuius rei caussam rationemque in eo affirmat residere, quod *ab ipso incarnato Dei Verbo, sed et omnibus sanctis synodis, secundum sacros canones et terminos, universarum quae in toto terrarum orbe sunt sanctarum Dei Ecclesiarum in omnibus et per omnia percepit et habet imperium, auctoritatem et potestatem ligandi et solvendi. Cum hoc enim ligat et solvit, etiam in caelo Verbum, quod caelestibus virtutibus principatur.*[1] Quod igitur erat in fide christiana, quod non una gens, aut una aetas, sed aetates omnes, et Oriens pariter atque Occidens agnoscere atque observare consueverat, id meminit, nullo contradicente ad Ephesinam Synodum Philippus presbyter, a Pontifice legatus: *Nulli dubium est, imo saeculis omnibus notum, quod sanctus beatissimusque Petrus, Apostolorum princeps et caput, fideique columna et Ecclesiae catholicae fundamentum, a Domino nostro Iesu Christo, salvatore humani generis ac redemptore, claves regni accepit, solvendique ac ligandi peccata potestas ipsi data est, qui ad hoc usque tempus et semper in suis successoribus vivit et iudicium exercet.*[2] Eademque de re in omnium cognitione versatur Concilii Chalcedonensis sententia: *Petrus per Leonem . . . loquutus est*:[3] cui vox Concilii Constantinopolitani III resonat, tamquam imago: *Summus nobiscum concertabat Apostolorum princeps: illius enim imitatorem et Sedis successorem habuimus fautorem . . . charta et atramentum videbatur, et per Agathonem Petrus loquebatur.*[4] In formula catholicae professionis ab Hormisda conceptis verbis, ineunte saeculo sexto, proposita, cui tum Iustinianus Imperator, tum Epiphanius, Ioannes, et Menna Patriarchae subscripserunt,

1 *Defloratio ex Epistola ad Petrum illustrem.* 2 Actio iii.
3 Actio ii. 4 Actio xviii.

illud est magna vi sententiarum declaratum: *Quia non potest Domini nostri Iesu Christi praetermitti sententia dicentis:* Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam . . . *haec, quae dicta sunt, rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolica citra maculam semper est catholica servata religio.*[1] Nolumus quidem persequi singula: libet tamen formulam fidei meminisse, quam Michael Palaeologus in Concilio Lugdunensi II professus est: *Ipsa quoque sancta romana Ecclesia summum et plenum primatum et principatum super universam Ecclesiam catholicam obtinet, quem se ab ipso Domino in beato Petro, Apostolorum principe sive vertice, cuius romanus Pontifex est successor, cum potestatis plenitudine recepisse veraciter et humiliter recognoscit. Et sicut prae ceteris tenetur fidei veritatem defendere, sic et si quae de fide subortae fuerint quaestiones, suo debent iudicio definiri.*[2]

Si Petri eiusque successorum plena ac summa potestas est, ea tamen esse ne putetur sola. Nam qui Petrum Ecclesiae fundamentum posuit, idem *elegit duodecim . . . quos et apostolos nominavit.*[3] Quo modo Petri auctoritatem in romano Pontifice perpetuam permanere necesse est, sic Episcopi, quod succedunt Apostolis, horum potestatem ordinariam hereditate capiunt; ita ut intimam Ecclesiae constitutionem ordo episcoporum necessario attingat. Quamquam vero neque plenam neque universalem ii, neque summam obtinent auctoritatem, non tamen *vicarii* romanorum pontificum putandi, quia potestatem gerunt sibi propriam, verissimeque populorum, quos regunt, antistites *ordinarii* dicuntur.

Verum quia successor Petri unus est, Apostolorum permulti, consentaneum est perspicere quae sint istorum cum illo, divina constitutione, necessitudines.—Ac primo quidem coniunctionis episcoporum cum eo qui Petro succedit, non obscura est neque dubia necessitas: hoc enim soluto nexu, solvitur ac diffluit multitudo ipsa christianorum, ita plane ut nullo pacto queat unum corpus conflare unumque gregem: *Ecclesiae salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet,*

1 Post Epistolam xxvi, ad omnes Episc. Hispan., n. 4.
2 Actio vi. 3 Luc. vi, 13.

cui si non exsors quaedam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesia efficientur schismata, quot sacerdotes.[1] Idcirco ad id praestat advertere animum: nihil esse Apostolis seorsum a Petro collatum; plura seorsum ab Apostolis ac separatim Petro. Ioannes Chrysostomus in Christi edisserenda sententia (Ioan. xxi, 15) cum percontatus esset, *Cur, aliis praetermissis, de his Christus Petrum alloquitur?* omnino respondet: *Eximius erat inter Apostolos, et os discipulorum, et coetus illius caput.*[2] Hic enim unus designatus a Christo est fundamentum Ecclesiae; ipse *ligandi* copia *solvendique* permissa, eidemque *pascendi* data potestas uni. Contra quidquid auctoritatis ac muneris accepere Apostoli, coniuncte cum Petro accepere: *Divina dignatio si quid cum eo commune ceteris voluit esse principibus, nunquam nisi per ipsum dedit, quidquid aliis non negavit.*[3] *Ut cum multa solus acceperit, nihil in quemquam sine ipsius participatione transierit.*[4] Ex quo plane intelligitur, excidere episcopos iure ac potestate regendi, si a Petro eiusve successoribus scientes secesserint. Nam a fundamento, quo totum debet aedificium niti, seccessione divelluntur; itaque exclusi *aedificio* ipso sunt: ob eamdemque caussam ab *ovili* seiuncti, cui dux est pastor maximus, *regnoque* extorres, cuius uni Petro datae divinitus claves.

Quibus rebus rursus noscimus in constituenda christiana republica caelestem descriptionem mentemque divinam. Videlicet cum Ecclesiam divinus auctor fide et regimine et communione unam esse decrevisset. Petrum eiusque successores delegit in quibus principium foret ac velut centrum unitatis. Quare Cyprianus: *Probatio est ad fidem facilis compendio veritatis. Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum:* Ego tibi dico, *inquit*, Quia tu es Petrus. . . . [*Super unum aedificat Ecclesiam. Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat et dicat: sicut misit me Pater, . . . tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis eiusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit.*[5] Atque Optatus Milevitanus:

1 S. Hieronymus, Dialog. *Contra Luciferianos*, n. 9.
2 Hom. lxxxviii, *in Ioan.* n. 1.
3 S. Leo M. sermo iv, cap. 2.
4 Ib.
5 *De Unit. Eccl.*, n. 4.

Negare non potes, scire te in urbe Roma Petro primo Cathedram episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederit omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas appellatus est: in qua una Cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur: ne ceteri Apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent, ut iam schismaticus et peccator esset, qui contra singularem Cathedram alteram collocaret.[1] Unde est illa ipsius Cypriani sententia, cum haeresim tum schisma ex eo ortum habere gignique, quod debita supremae potestati obedientia abiicitur: *Neque enim aliunde haereses obortae sunt aut nata sunt schismata, quam inde quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus iudex vice Christi cogitatur.*[2] Nemo igitur, nisi cum Petro cohaereat, participare auctoritatem potest, cum absurdum sit opinari, qui extra Ecclesiam est, eum in Ecclesia praeesse. Quare Optatus Milevitanus reprehendebat hoc nomine Donatistas: *Contra quas portas* (inferi) *claves salutares accepisse legimus Petrum, principem scilicet nostrum, cui a Christo dictum est: tibi dabo claves regni caelorum, et portae inferi non vincent eas. Unde est ergo, quod claves regni caelorum vobis usurpare contenditis, qui contra cathedram Petri . . . militatis?*[3]

Sed Episcoporum ordo tunc rite, ut Christus iussit, colligatus cum Petro putandus, si Petro subsit eique pareat: secus in multitudinem confusam ac perturbatam necessario delabitur. Fidei et communionis unitati rite conservandae, non gerere honoris caussâ priores partes, non curam agere satis est; sed omnino auctoritate est opus vera eademque summa, cui obtemperet tota communitas. Quid enim Dei Filius spectavit, cum claves regni caelorum *uni* pollicitus est Petro? Summum fastigium potestatis nomine *clavium* eo loco designari, *usus biblicus* et Patrum consentientes sententiae dubitari non sinunt. Neque secus interpretari fas est, quae vel Petro separatim tributa sunt, vel Apostolis coniunctim cum Petro. Si ligandi, solvendi, pascendique facultas hoc parit in episcopis, successoribus Apostolorum, ut populum quisque suum vera cum potestate regat, certe idem parere eadem facultas in eo debet, cui pascendi

1 *De Schism. Donat.*, lib. ii. 2 Epist. xii, ad Cornelium, n. 5.
3 Lib. ii, n. 4, 5.

agnos et *oves* assignatum est, Deo auctore, munus: *Non solum pastorem* (*Petrum*), *sed pastorum pastorem* (*Christus*) *constituit: pascit igitur Petrus agnos et oves, pascit filios, pascit et matres: regit subditos, regit et praelatos quia praeter agnos et oves in Ecclesia nihil est.*[1] Hinc illae de beato Petro singulares veterum locutiones, quae in summo dignitatis potestatisque gradu locatum luculente praedicant. Appellant passim *principem coetus discipulorum: sanctorum Apostolorum principem: chori illius coryphaeum: os Apostolorum omnium: caput illius familiae: orbis totius praepositum: inter Apostolos primum: Ecclesiae columen.* Quae omnia concludere Bernardus iis verbis videtur ad Eugenium Papam: *Quis es? Sacerdos magnus, summus pontifex. Tu princeps episcoporum, tu heres Apostolorum . . . Tu es, cui claves traditae, cui oves creditae sunt. Sunt quidem et alii caeli ianitores et gregum pastores; sed tu tanto gloriosius, quanto et differentius utrumque prae ceteris nomen hereditasti. Habent illi sibi assignatos greges, singuli singulos, tibi universi crediti, uni unus, nec modo ovium, sed et pastorum, tu unus omnium pastor. Unde id probem quaeris. Ex verbo Domini. Cui enim, non dico episcoporum, sed etiam Apostolorum, sic absolute et indiscrete totae commissae sunt oves? Si me amas, Petre, pasce oves meas. Quas? illius vel illius populos civitatis aut regionis, aut certi regni? Oves meas, inquit: cui non planum, non designasse aliquas, sed assignasse omnes? Nihil excipitur, ubi distinguitur nihil.*[2]

Illud vero abhorret a veritate, et aperte repugnat constitutioni divinae, iurisdictioni romanorum Pontificum episcopos subesse *singulos*, ius esse; *universos*, ius non esse. Haec enim omnis est caussa ratioque fundamenti, ut unitatem stabilitatemque toti potius aedificio, quam *partibus* eius *singulis* tueatur. Quod est in caussa, de qua loquimur, multo verius, quia Christus Dominus fundamenti virtute confieri voluit, ut portae inferi non praevaleant adversus Ecclesiam. Quod promissum divinum constat inter omnes de Ecclesia universa intelligi oportere, non de singulis eius partibus, quippe quae utique vinci inferorum impetu possunt, nonnullisque

1 S. Brunonis Episcopi Signiensis *Comment. in Ioan.* part. iii, cap. 21, n. 55.
2 *De Consideratione*, lib. ii, cap. 8.

earum, ut vincerentur, singillatim evenit. Rursus, qui gregi praepositus est universo, eum non modo in oves dispersas, sed prorsus in multitudinem insimul congregatarum habere imperium necesse est. Num regat agatque pastorem suum universitas ovium? Num successores Apostolorum, simul coniuncti, fundamentum sint, quo Petri successor, adipiscendi firmamenti caussâ, innitatur? Profecto cuius in potestate sunt claves regni, ei ius atque auctoritas est non tantum in provincias singulares, sed in universas simul: et quo modo episcopi in regione quisque sua non solum privato cuique, sed etiam communitati vera cum potestate praesunt, ita Pontifices romani, quorum potestas christianam rempublicam totam complectitur, omnes eius partes, etiam una collectas, subiectas atque obedientes habent potestati suae. Christus Dominus, quod iam dictum satis, Petro eiusque successoribus tribuit ut essent *vicarii* sui, atque eamdem in Ecclesia perpetuo gererent potestatem, quam ipsemet gesserat in vita mortali. Num Apostolorum collegium magistro suo praestitisse auctoritate dicatur?

Hanc vero, de qua dicimus, in ipsum episcoporum collegium potestatem, quam sacrae litterae tam aperte enuntiant, agnoscere ac testari nullo tempore Ecclesia destitit. Illa sunt in hoc genere effata Conciliorum: *Romanum pontificem de omnium Ecclesiarum praesulibus iudicasse legimus: de eo vero quemquam iudicasse, non legimus.*[1] Cuius rei ea ratio redditur, quod *auctoritate Sedis Apostolicae maior non est.*[2] Quare de Conciliorum decretis Gelasius: *Sicut id quod prima Sedes non probaverat, constare non potuit, sic quod illa censuit iudicandum, Ecclesia tota suscepit.*[3] Sane Conciliorum consulta et decreta, rata habere vel infirmare semper romanorum Pontificum fuit. Conciliabuli Ephesini acta rescidit Leo magnus: Ariminensis, reiecit Damasus: Con-

1 Hadrianus II, *in Allocutione iii*, ad Synodum Romanam an. 869. Cf. Actionem vii, Concilii Constantinopolitana iv.

2 Nicolaus in epist. lxxxvi, Ad Michael. Imperat.—*Patet profecto Sedis Apostolicae, cuius auctoritate maior non est, iudicium a nemine fore retractandum, neque cuiquam de eius liceat iudicare iudicio.*

3 Epist. xxvi, ad Episcopos Dardaniae, n. 5.

stantinopolitani, Hadrianus I; canonem vero xxviii Concilii Chalcedonensis, quod assensu et auctoritate caruit Sedis Apostolicae, velut incassum quiddam constat iacuisse. Recte igitur in Concilio Lateranensi V Leo X statuit: *Solum romanum Pontificem, pro tempore existentem, tamquam auctoritatem super omnia concilia habentem, tam Conciliorum indicendorum, transferendorum, ac dissolvendorum plenum ius ac potestatem habere, nedum ex sacrae Scripturae testimonio dictisque Patrum ac aliorum romanorum Pontificum, sacrorumque canonum decretis, sed propria etiam eorumdem Conciliorum confessione manifeste constat.* Sane claves regni caelorum uni creditas Petro, item ligandi solvendique potestatem Apostolis una cum Petro collatam, sacrae litterae testantur: at vero summam potestatem *sine Petro* et *contra Petrum* unde Apostoli acceperint, nusquam est testatum. Profecto a Iesu Christo nullo pacto accepere. Quibus de caussis, Concilii Vaticani decreto, quod est de vi et ratione primatus Romani Pontificis, non opinio est invecta nova, sed vetus et constans omnium saeculorum asserta fides.[1]

Neque vero potestati geminae eosdem subesse, confusionem habet administrationis. Tale quicquam suspicari, primum sapientia Dei prohibemur, cuius consilio est temperatio isthaec regiminis constituta. Illud praeterea animadvertendum, tum rerum ordinem mutuasque necessitudines perturbari, si bini magistratus in populo sint eodem gradu, neutro alteri obnoxio. Sed romani pontificis potestas summa est, universalis, planeque sui iuris; episcoporum vero certis circumscripta finibus, nec plane sui iuris: *Inconveniens est, quod duo aequaliter super eumdem gregem constituantur. Sed quod duo, quorum unus alio principalior est, super eamdem plebem constituantur, non est inconveniens; et secundum hoc super eamdem plebem immediate sunt et Sacerdos parochialis et Episcopus et Papa.*[2] Romani autem Pontifices, officii sui memores, maxime omnium conservari volunt quidquid est in Ecclesia divinitus constitutum: propterea quemadmodum potestatem suam ea

1 Sess. iv, cap. 3.

2 S. Thomas *in IV. Sent.* dist. xvii, a. 4, ad q. 4, ad 3.

qua par est cura vigilantiâque tuentur, ita et dedere et dabunt constanter operam ut sua Episcopis auctoritas salva sit. Imo quidquid Episcopis tribuitur honoris, quidquid obsequii, id omne sibimetipsis tributum deputant. *Meus honor est honor universalis Ecclesiae. Meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tunc ego vere honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur.*[1]

His quae dicta sunt, Ecclesiae quidem imaginem atque formam ex divina constitutione fideliter expressimus. Plura persecuti de unitate sumus; cuiusmodi hanc esse, quo conservandam principio divinus auctor voluerit, satis explicavimus. Quotquot divino munere beneficioque contigit, ut in sinu Ecclesiae catholicae tamquam ex ea nati vivant, eos vocem Nostram apostolicam audituros, non est cur dubitemus: *Oves meae vocem meam audiunt.*[2] Atque hinc facile sumpserint quo et erudiantur plenius, et voluntate propensiore cum pastoribus quisque suis et per eos cum pastore summo cohaereant, ut tutius queant intra ovile unicum permanere, fructuumque ex eo salutarium maiorem ubertatem capere. Verum aspicientibus Nobis *in auctorem fidei et consummatorem Iesum*,[3] cuius vicaria potestate, tametsi impares dignitati et muneri, fungimur, caritate eius inflammatur animus; illudque de se a Christo dictum, de Nobismetipsis non sine caussa usurpamus: *Alias oves habeo, quae non sunt ex hoc ovili: et illas oportet me adducere, et vocem meam audient.*[4] Nos igitur audire et caritati Nostrae paternae obsequi ne recusent, quotquot sunt, qui impietatem tam late fusam oderunt, et Iesum Christum Filium Dei eumdemque servatorem generis humani agnoscunt et fatentur, sed tamen vagantur ab eius Sponsa longius. Qui Christum sumunt, totum sumant necesse est: *Totus Christus, caput et corpus est: caput unigeniuts Filius Dei, corpus eius Ecclesia: sponsus et sponsa, duo in carne una. Quicumque de ipso capite a Scripturis sanctis dissentiunt, etiamsi in omnibus locis inveniantur in quibus Ecclesia designata est, non sunt in Ecclesia. Et rursus, quicumque de ipso capite Scripturis sanctis consentiunt, et unitati*

1 S. Gregorius M. *Epistolarum* lib. viii, epist. xxx, ad Eulogium.
2 Ioan. x, 27. 3 Hebr. xii, 2. 4 Ioan. x, 16.

Ecclesiae non communicant, non sunt in Ecclesia.[1] Ac pari studio ad eos provolat animus Noster, quos impietatis non funditus corrupit pestilens afflatus, quique hoc saltem expetunt, sibi patris esse loco Deum verum, terrae caelique opificem. Hi quidem apud se reputent ac plane intelligant, numerari se in filiis Dei nequaquam posse, nisi fratrem sibi Iesum Christum simulque Ecclesiam matrem adsciverint. Omnes igitur peramanter, sumpta ex Augustino ipso sententia, compellamus: *Amemus Deum nostrum, amemus Ecclesiam eius: illum sicut patreu, istam sicut matrem. Nemo dicat: ad idola quidem vado, arreptitios et sortilegos conuslo, sed tamen Dei Ecclesiam non relinquo: catholicus sum. Tenens matrem, offendisti patrem. Alius item dicit: absit a me, non consulo sortilegum, non quaero arreptitium, non quaero divinationes sacrilegas, non eo ad adoranda daemonia, non servio lapidibus: sed tamen in parte Donati sum. Quid libi prodest non offensus pater, qui offensam vindicat matrem? Quid prodest si Dominum confiteris, Deum honoras, ipsum praedicas, Filium eius agnoscis, sedentem ad Patris dexteram confiteris, et blasphemas Ecclesiam eius? . . . Si haberes aliquem patronum, cui quotidie obsequereris; si unum crimen de eius coniuge diceres, num quid domum eius intrares? Tenete ergo, carissimi, tenete omnes unanimiter Deum patrem et matrem Ecclesiam.*[2]

Plurimum misericordi Deo confisi, qui maxime potest animos hominum permovere, et unde vult, et quo vult impellere, benignitati eius universos, quos in oratione spectavimus, vehementer commendamus. Caelestium vero donorum auspicem et benevolentiae Nostrae testem vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, Clero populoque vestro Apostolicam benedictionem peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum die XXIX Iunii, An. MDCCCLXXXXVI, Pontificatus Nostri decimo nono.

LEO PP. XIII.

1 S. Augustinus, *Contra Donatistas Epistola, sive De Unit. Eccl.* cap. iv, n. 7.

2 *Enarratio in Psal. lxxxviii*, sermo ii, n. 14.

E S. CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

DECRETUM PERMITTENS MISSAS PRIVATAS DE REQUIE IN DUPLICIBUS.

Aucto, postremis hisce temporibus, maxime in calendariis particularibus, Officiorum Duplicium numero, quum pauci supersint per annum dies, qui Missas privatas de Requie fieri permittant, et ipsa officia semiduplicia interdum ab aliis potioris ritus impediantur, nonnulli ecclesiastici viri pietate, doctrina ac dignitate praestantes, Sanctissimum Dominum Nostrum Leonem Papam XIII humillimis enixisque precibus rogarunt, ut, ad juvamen fidelium defunctorum et ad spirituale solatium vivorum, in Ecclesiis et Oratoriis sive publicis sive privatis, praesertim iis, quae in sepulcretis rite erecta sunt vel erigentur, Missae lectae de Requie diebus etiam duplicibus aliquoties per annum de Apostolica Benignitate celebrari valeant. Placuit autem eidem Ssmo Domino Nostro hujus negotii examen Sacrae Rituum Congregationi committere: quae, exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibus mature perpensis, attentisque hac de re etiam peculiaribus locorum circumstantiis, in Ordinario Coetu subsignata die ad Vaticanum coadunato, ad propositam per infrascriptum Cardinalem Sacrae eidem Congregationi Praefectum quaestionem, respondendum censuit:

Si Sanctissimo placuerit: I. In quolibet Sacello sepulcreti rite erecto vel erigendo, Missas, quae inibi celebrari permittuntur, posse esse de Requie diebus non impeditis a Festo duplici 1^ae^ vel 2^ae^ classis, a Dominicis aliisque festis de praecepto servandis, necnon a Feriis, Vigiliis, Octavisque privilegiatis; item: II. quibuslibet Ecclesiis et Oratoriis quum publicis tum privatis et in Sacellis ad Seminaria, Collegia et Religiosas vel pias utriusque sexus Communitates spectantibus, Missas privatas de Requie, praesente, insepulto, vel etiam sepulto non ultra biduum, cadavere, fieri posse die vel pro die obitus aut depositionis: verum sub clausulis et conditionibus, quibus, juxta Rubricas et Decreta, Missa solemnis de Requie iisdem in casibus decantatur. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 19 Maii 1896.

Facta postmodum de his Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leoni Papae XIII per meipsum infrascriptum Cardinalem, relatione, Sanctitas Sua sententiam Sacrae ipsius Congregationis in omnibus ratam habere et confirmare dignata est, die 8 Junii, eodem anno.

CAJETANUS *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *S.R.C., Praef.*
L. ✠ S. A. TRIPEPI, *S.R.C., Secret.*

E. S. CONGREGATIONE DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.

OBSERVANDA PRO PLANIORI NEGOTIORUM TRANSMISSIONE.

Illmis ac Rmis Ordinariis Missionum, quae a S. Congr. de Propaganda Fide dependent.

Cum multiplicitas negotiorum, quae ab hac S. Congregatione de Prop. Fide pro locis missionum sibi creditis agenda sunt, in dies augeatur, optatissimum est ut ea, quae expeditionem rerum tractandarum retardant, removeantur.

Hinc est quod infrascriptus Archiep. Larissen. S.C. de Prop. Fide Secretarius, juxta mentem Emi Cardinalis ejusdem S.C. Praefecti, nonnulla, quae experientia edocuit minus convenire, RRmis LL. Ordinariis indicare necessarium judicat, rogans eos ut pro sapientia et zelo, quibus praestant, eadem in negotiis cum hac S.C. curandis observanda quibus oportet commendare velint.

Et in primis plurimum interest ut non solum litterae ad hanc S.C. expeditae, sed etiam, et praesertim documenta iisdem adjuncta, latino exarata sint sermone, vel italico aut gallico, ceterarum enim linguarum communis adhuc non habetur cognitio, et interpretum opera longior evadere solet, nec semper satis est secura.

Insuper non raro accidit ut litterae, quae recipiuntur, tam informi calamo conscriptae sint ut eas perlegere difficillimum sit etiam peritis, neque id obtinetur absque magna temporis jactura gravique labore. Aliquando etiam chartae adhibentur coloris caerulei, aut subobscuri, aut transparentis, atramentum vero coloris fere albi, ita ut lectoris visus improbe

defatigetur. Instanter igitur rogatur ut hujusmodi impedimenta e medio tollantur.

Nec incongruum est hic animadvertere nonnunquam in epistolis quae ad S. Cong., vel ad Sanctitatem Suam per ipsam S. Congr. mittuntur, formam exteriorem magis respondentem dignitati virorum quibus praesentandae sunt, desiderari. Tum folio litterarum et documentorum ita saepissime scripta sunt, ut ordo scriptionis unius paginae sit inversus in successiva et hinc cum ex his foliis, pro eorum conservatione in Archivio, libri conficiuntur, isti pro singulis paginis legendis ab imo deorsum verti debent, non sine inutili lectoris incommodo et fastidio.

Tandem et aliud inconveniens aliquando locum habet, quod scilicet a S. Congr. in receptione epistolarum, pro insufficienti solutione pretii transmissionis a mittentibus, duplex taxa solvenda est; unde quotannis non exigua pecuniae summa necessitatibus quotidie crescentibus Missionum subtrahitur.

Ah haec omnia incommoda efficaciter removenda infrascriptus Secretarius desiderium hujus S. Consilii, non semel sibi patefactum per praesentes litteras evulgare censet, iterumque rogat ut litterae et documenta, quae ad hanc S. Congr. mittuntur:

1. Latino idiomate, vel saltem italico aut gallico, exarata sint, sicut cautum fuit per litteras circulares hujus S. Congreg. diei 1 Februarii 1892:

2. Ut intelligibili charactere conscribantur, praesertim quoad nomina propria personarum et locorum, convenientemque exteriorum praeseferant formam quoad chartae dimensiones, quae charta sit albi coloris et atramentum nigrum:

3. Ut ordo scriptionis paginarum is sit, qui servantur in libris qui typis eduntur:

4. Ut praescripta a lege in singulis regionibus pro expediendis litteris taxa exacte a mittentibus solvatur.

Datum Romae ex aedibus Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide die 18 Maji 1896.

A. CIASCA, *Secretarius.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

EPISCOPUS LUCRATUR INDULGENTIAM QUAM IMPERTIT NOMINE PAPAE.

Episcopus Montis Politiani huic S. Cong'ni Indulg. sequens dubium solvendum proposuit:

Num plenariam Indulgentiam lucrandam a christifidelibus Benedictionem nomine Summi Pontificis recipientibus a respectivis Episcopis, lucrari valeat et ipse Episcopus qui eam impertit?

Et Emi Patres in Congregatione generali ad Vaticanas Aedes habita, de Indulgentia Plenaria adnexa Benedictioni Papali lucranda ab Epo eam elargiente responderunt:

Affirmative. Facto verbo cum SSmo. Et SSmus D. N. Leo Pp. XIII in Audientia habita ab infrascripto S. Congnis Praefecto, die 20 Maji 1896, responsionem Emorum Patrum benigne approbavit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria S. Congnis, die 20 Maji 1896.

ANDREAS *Card.* STEINHUBER, *S.C., Praef.*

L. ✠ S. ALEX. ARCHIEP. NICOPOL., *S.C., Secrius.*

CONFERENCES.

IMPORTANT DECISION PERMITTING A LOW MASS OF REQUIEM ON DOUBLE FEASTS.

By a recent decree of the S. Congregation, the full text of which may be found in our ANALECTA, the following privilege is accorded for the celebration of Requiem-masses.

A *low* Mass *de Requie* may be celebrated in any church or chapel "praesente, insepulto, vel etiam sepulto non ultra biduum cadavere" on feasts of double minor or major rite, except days of the first and second class, Sundays, Holy days of obligation, and privileged Ferials, Vigils or Octaves. For the rest the same restrictions are to be observed as in the case of solemn masses *de Requie.*

The second part of the pontifical concession extends to *mortuary chapels*, in which any priest may celebrate a low mass *de Requie* on double feasts, with the above mentioned exceptions.

Both of these concessions make important changes in the general rubrics, and should be made officially known in all the dioceses. Hitherto a funeral mass had to be *sung* if it occurred on a double, or else it was dispensed with altogether. The Holy See had occasionally granted special exemptions in localities (ex. gr. Vic. Apost. Cocincinae Occid. S. C. de Prop. 30 Iul. 1854) where poverty, or the absence of chanters, etc., made the solemn funeral service, for the most part, impossible. At present the low mass may be said in any place for the *missa cantata*, doing away with the necessity of deferring the funeral or having it without mass where a solemn service cannot be held.

Another advantage of this concession is the increase of devotion "pro defunctis," through the probable erection of a larger number of mortuary chapels in cemeteries, or

attached to the parish churches having cemeteries, where requiem masses may be celebrated on almost any day in the year, independent of the funeral rites.

MANNER OF ADDRESSING LETTERS TO THE SACRED CONGREGATION.

The immense number of petitions, reports, inquiries, etc., sent continually to the office of the S. Congregation of the Propaganda from all parts of the world, make it imperative that certain formalities in the writing and presentation of letters to said Congregation be observed. Accordingly Mgr. A. Ciasca, the official secretary, calls the attention of persons addressing the S. C., to the following points :

1. All documents and letters should be written in Latin, French or Italian.

2. The writing should be clear and legible especially as regards names of persons and places.

3. As to the form of manuscript, besides being written in black ink on white paper, the pages should follow each other in regular order like those of a printed book, and not (as an odd modern custom has it) having the lines run down one page and up the next.

4. The full postage should be paid by the sender.

One would think that it were needless to mention these items as being self evident requisites of business propriety and courtesy ; nevertheless it appears that they are frequently overlooked, and with the immense correspondence daily addressed to the S. Congregation, such neglect becomes a serious source of annoyance and expense.

THE DATE OF EPISCOPAL ELECTIONS.

Doubt has arisen regarding the exact date on which Bishops are to celebrate the anniversary of their promotion to the Episcopal dignity. A recent decree of the S. C. of Rites

given to the Archbishop Coadjutor of Quebec, (Dec. 13, 1895, Dub. vii), fixes the date as that in which they were proclaimed in secret Consistory, even though, meanwhile, they had received Episcopal Consecration, and taken full possession of their sees.

A further doubt occurred regarding those who, for one reason or another,—having been appointed directly by Apostolic letters, as is the case of American Prelates, were not preconized in Consistory.

The Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda, by letter dated July 31, 1896, to one of our Metropolitans, gives the following information:

If the Bishop were preconized in Consistory, even after his consecration and induction into office, the anniversary of his election is to be determined from the date of the Consistory; if his election were not proclaimed in Consistory, it is to be dated from the date of the Apostolic Brief of appointment.

ADMITTING CHILDREN TO FIRST COMMUNION OUTSIDE OF THE PARISH.

Qu. There are a number of parents in my parish whose children attend private schools. These children are in some cases sent to a convent of nuns to be prepared for their First Communion. I have never objected to the arrangement so long as there was a moral certainty that the instruction given was adequate, and the children were also permitted to receive their First Communion in the convent chapel or wherever the parents wished.

One of our priests believes that this method is encouraging abuses and that the children of the parish should be forced not only to receive in the parish church, but also to attend the preparatory instruction for First Communion given to the parochial school children. I see much that might be said in favor of such a rule, but also much that is against it. Would you state in THE REVIEW whether there is anything in ecclesiastical legislation which determines the question one way or another?

Resp. Whilst parents have the duty to have their children properly instructed and prepared for the reception of the

Sacraments, they are entirely free in the choice of the particular means by which this end may be reached. The pastor's care extends over the children, indeed, but simply in order that they might be rightly trained in the knowledge and appreciation of the Catholic faith. His office, in their regard, is simply a responsibility, whilst in regard to the parents the priest has also a right to support from them.

But since the pastor, in order to satisfy his responsibility, must know whether the children of his flock are properly trained and prepared for the Sacraments, it is just that he should be informed and give his sanction to each child who is to make its First Communion under separate guidance.

Hence follows a rule of action equally consistent with the legislation of the Church, and with common sense, viz.:

1. That a parent has full right to have his child prepared for, and receive, First Communion anywhere, and that the pastor cannot justly interfere *except* in so far as *to assure himself that the child is properly qualified to receive the Sacraments.*

2. That the parent has *the duty of obtaining the sanction of the pastor* for having his child receive First Communion outside of the parish church.

The number of children for whom this privilege is claimed must always be small where there is a good parochial school; and where there is no school it is perhaps for the greater good of the children that they should be instructed by the religious. Hence, the fear of abuses is hardly well founded. To refuse a parent permission to have his child receive First Communion in some private chapel under the care of his instructors and special friends would seem to be a mere piece of ill-natured self-assertion and effects no good. Moreover, it is contrary to the spirit of parochial ministration as may be gathered from the decisions of the disciplinary court in the Church. Not very many years ago the S. Congregation of Propaganda was asked whether the Fathers of the Mission who give cathechetical instruction to children in their convents have the right to admit them to First Communion, and whether pastors could prevent this on the ground that these children belong to their parishes.

The Holy See answered that the Lazarist Fathers had a perfect right in the matter and that it was the Bishop's duty to see that no pastor would refuse the permission to any child properly prepared—"che cioè i communicandi siano forniti della debita licenza del loro parroco, che non deve negarla a chicchessia riconosciuto idoneo." (Ex Litt. S. C. de Prop. Fide, 6 Jun., 1839. Coll. Miss. n. 727.)

THE BAPTISM OF CONVERTS.

Qu. Would you kindly advise me whether converts to the Church whose previous baptism was *apparently* valid, are to be re-baptized conditionally? In most cases the sole cause of doubt is its having been administered by non-Catholics. Thus a convert from Lutheranism tells me that she was baptized soon after birth as it was feared that she could not live. As the act surely implied the intention of doing what Christ has instituted, I did not re-baptize her.

I am told that in England, Anglicans are not re-baptized. Hence, I refrain from baptizing such converts, although I am inclined to baptize converts from the Episcopal Church in the U. St. Is there any difference between the Old and the New World Anglicans as to baptism?

Resp. The general rule is that baptism is to be administered where there is a *probable doubt* as to the validity of the previous baptism.

To eliminate such doubt in individual cases the S. Congregation ordains that the actual custom of the sect to which the convert belonged at the time of baptism be ascertained. But it is difficult in practice to form any rule from such custom since the right of private judgment naturally exerts its influence on individual representatives of any sect, and this may vitiate the ritual act and render the baptism invalid. In certain churches like the Lutheran and the High Church of England, special stress is laid upon the observance of the ritual, and hence their baptisms, if vouched for by witnesses and by the convert whose interest it is to ascertain the truth in the matter, may be presumed to be valid. Yet we know of a Lutheran minister who, though quite evan-

gelical, baptizes by simply sprinkling a few drops of water upon the child wrapped in its swaddling clothes, just as we use holy water.

It is therefore a question of individual inquiry, which if it leaves a probable doubt, would demand at least conditional baptism.

As to difference between Anglicans in England and Episcopalians in America, no general rule can be laid down, although it is safe to say that the clergy of the English High Church have a deeper sense of religious respect for tradition, etc., than Americans, and hence are likely to be more observant of the ancient forms. Still we meet with cases in America where Episcopalian ministers are very scrupulous in this matter. Each case must be judged on its individual merits.

SINGING OF THE "DIES IRAE."

Qu. According to a decree of the S. Congregation, the singing of the *Dies Irae* at solemn Requiem Masses is obligatory. Does this mean that the choir is to chant the entire sequence, or does it suffice to sing a part and recite the rest?

Can the celebrant go on with the mass whilst the choir is singing the *Dies Irae?*

Resp. The entire sequence need not be sung. "Sequentiam *Dies Irae* semper dicendam in missis de Requie quae cum unica tantam oratione decantantur, verum aliquas strophas illius cantores praetermittere posse." (S. R. C. 12 Aug., 1854.)

It is against the rubrics of the missal to continue the mass whilst the choir is chanting the *Dies Irae*, as it obliges the celebrant to omit the singing of the "Dominus vobiscum" before the offertory.

A SUB-DEACON ACTING AS DEACON.

Qu. Does a sub-deacon become irregular by the fact of his assuming the place of the Deacon at solemn Mass, but without using

the words "Dominus vobiscum," or "Ite missa est," although he sings the Gospel?

The sub-deacon acts in the case *ficte*, as theologians say, and only because there is no priest or deacon to be had to assist at the solemn Mass previously announced.

Resp. The probability is that the said sub-deacon incurs irregularity in the case, although he may intend no malice. Ballerini in his large work on Moral Theology (Vol. vii, n. 632, 3) says: "Si quis clericus inferior Diaconum agat assistendo in Missa presbytero vel Episcopo, functiones proprias Diaconi exercendo, irregularis fiet, puto, etsi careat stola." A little further on he asks: "Quid vero si *ficte* tantum fiat, h. e. actio quidem exterior tota serio ponatur, sed sine intentione exercendi Ordinem?" And answers by citing the authority of Zuarez in the affirmative, because the intention of really exercising the act which belongs to an Order not conferred on him, is not requisite in order that a cleric may incur irregularity. (L. c., n. 5.)

THE CATHOLIC SERVICE AT SUMMER RESORTS.

A reverend confrere calls our attention to the fact that nearly all the prominent hotels at summer resorts display cards in their halls on which the hours of Church service in the locality are noted for the benefit of guests. Frequently such notices are conspicuous for their omission of the Catholic service, although it is well known that Catholics are as a rule anxious to hear Mass on Sundays and Holidays.

Whilst it may be difficult to overcome the bigotry of hotel-keepers, it is possible and desirable to keep visiting Catholics informed of the regular hours of Mass and Benediction. A respectable notice in some conspicuous place near the exit of stations, baths or hotels, and at the Church door, would relieve Catholic travelers at times of much embarrassment, and, where there is regularly a good sermon, may lead strangers to find their way to the truth of Christ.

BOOK REVIEW.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGICAE IN USUM SCHOLARUM, Auctore G. Bernardo Tepe, S. J. Vol. III. Parisiis, P. Lethielleux 1896. pp. 780.

The attention of our readers has already been called in the REVIEW to the first two volumes of Father Tepe's course of theology, in which he treated of the basal principles and as much of the subject itself as is covered by the Tracts on God as One, Triune and Creator. The logical advance of his dissertations brings him next to the questions on Grace, the Theological Virtues and the Incarnation. To these three Tracts the volume before us is devoted.

There is probably no other portion of theology which so rapidly demands that the mental habit of the science be rooted in the mind of its expositor as that of divine grace. Here above all great breadth of view, keenness of insight, delicacy of discernment are essential to the theologian, for here is the meeting and interplay of the two orders that exhaust the categories of existence,—the finite and the infinite, the natural and the supernatural, the human touched, uplifted, sanctified, deified by the divine. How much of efficacy is left in fallen nature for the knowing of the true and the doing of the good? What is the necessity, how far does it reach, of the supernatural help of God for man to live aright and to reach his end? How is efficacious grace compatible with human freedom? What is the nature of that mysterious, elevating quality—sanctifying grace, what is its bearing on justification, on the generating of the virtues, on merit for the here and the hereafter? What is predestination and what is meant by reprobation? The mere suggestion of such questions as are treated at length in the Tract on Grace shows the large and delicate task set before the writer on theology. That Father Tepe brings to this work the requisite endowments goes without saying with those who have carefully examined the former volumes of his course. What will particularly attract the earnest student of theology to the present volume will be its more expository than controversial character. The field it covers bristles all

over with subjects for polemics, but the author has not allowed himself to be drawn from his main purpose to lose himself in side issues. While he has not forgotten the questions controverted in the schools, for these very differences of opinion help very greatly to a better understanding of the points on which there is unanimity of assent, yet he is ever conscious that his main object as a teacher of Catholic theology is to inform the mind of his pupils that they may grasp the positive doctrine of the Church, may assimilate it to their own mental substance so as to convert it into power for perfecting their own lives and the souls of those to whom they are sent with the divine message.

Those of our readers who are familiar with Father Smith's recent book on "Our Seminaries" are not likely to forget his strong critique of the usual manner of teaching dogmatic theology, of the dry-as-dust formalism in which teaching is so generally encrusted; nor his earnest pleading for a more efficient method—a method in which the dogmas of the Church will be taught in the light of history past and present, in their bearing on men, on society, by the help of the analogies reflected from every day life, with appeal to the imagination and emotion of the student as well as to his intellect and memory.

The improvement in method must, of course, be the work of live professors. It could be wished, however, that some additional help were furnished in text-book literature. The text-book is indeed "but a text-book at best and needs the living teacher to put flesh on the skeleton it provides." Yet it were well that we had text-books themselves affording skeletons of the plan and build suggested by Father Smith as frames for the professor's work of upbuilding. Perhaps such adjuncts to the more efficient teaching of dogma are in store for the future. But they will always be supplements not substitutes for works such as this by Father Tepe—wherein the teaching of the Church is formulated, explained, demonstrated and defended by the old well-established criteria of theological truth, and if the student's mind be strengthened and disciplined by a course of theology made on these lines, auxiliary reading and the lecture of the style advocated by Father Smith will supply what is needed for the richer possessing of dogmetic theology.

We should mention in conclusion that another promised volume remains to complete the work of Father Tepe.

F. P. S.

DE SPONSALIBUS ET MATRIMONIO. Praelectiones Canonicae quas habebat Julius de Becker, SS. CC. et Jur. Civil. Doct., in Collegio Americano Almae Universitatis Lovaniensis Prof. Ord. Bruxellis: Société Belge de Librairie. 1896. Pp. 542.

It may be safely asserted that there is no branch of ecclesiastical jurisprudence which more effectually tests the theological temper and the ability of the confessor or canonist than the legislation "de sponsalibus et matrimonio." The principle of primary ecclesiastical jurisdiction in all matrimonial contracts has received the sanction of dogmatic definition in the Council of Trent; and the question regarding the right of temporal princes to constitute legal impediments annulling the validity of marriages has been practically settled since Urban VIII gave his decision in the case of Duke Gaston and Margaret of Orleans. Nevertheless there are countless delicate phases wherein the rights of parties concerned in the marriage contract are questioned, modified, annulled, revised or held in suspense according to the measure of their intention, tacit or expressed understanding, verbal interpretations, or any other real or supposed conditions which can affect the lawfulness or validity of an agreement between two persons. The Acts of the S. Congregations, particularly those of the Council and the Propaganda present innumerable solutions of doubts in individual cases representing curious anomalies of marriage contracts under all conceivable conditions. Thus it happens that a great deal has been written on this subject by moral theologians and canonists who not only illustrate old principles by new applications, but who aim at digesting the actual decisions of the ecclesiastical tribunals in novel cases, so as to draw from the practice of the sacred tribunal new principles of action for the priestly ministry.

In America, that is to say in the United States, the unequal conditions of society which naturally present a difficulty to the application of old laws, have been fairly recognized and met by the legislation of the Councils of Baltimore. We have had numerous excellent interpreters of the marriage law and its manifold applications to American circumstances by men like Heiss, Kenrick, Smith, Messmer, not to speak of Konings, Sabetti, Putzer and, on European soil, Nilles (Innsbruck) who all were thoroughly familiar with our peculiar conditions. To this number may be added our present author De Becker, professor at the Louvain University and particularly interested in the American College there. The prestige of the

Louvain University would give a passport to any work coming from its accredited teachers ; this is especially true in the branch of which Dr. De Becker treats. The comparatively recent works of Heuser and Feye on the subject of marriage (also of Moulart: *L'église et l'état*) give a unique authority to those who speak from the 'cathedra' of Louvain on the topic *de matrimonio*, and indeed our author declares himself particularly indebted to Feye, who was his predecessor in the theological chair.

It is needless to say that Prof. De Becker embodied in his work the most recent decisions and interpretations of the S. Office. In regard to the question of clandestinity, and the application of the Decree *Tametsi*, we do not think the limits are as precisely defined as the author assumes (pag. 124 and 125). The necessity or advantages of local uniformity in discipline seem to demand some change of law for localities where, as in St. Louis, the difference of practice causes constant annoyance to clergy and people, without any adequate good resulting from the same.

In his method Dr. De Becker follows on the whole the order of the Decretals of Gregory IX, deviating only where the subject matter demands a new division. Accordingly he treats successively *sponsalia, matrimonium universim spectatum*, and the two classes of *impedimenta*. Then follows a practical chapter on dispensations, and another on the duty of the confessor and pastor in regard to those who are about to marry. This section, although it covers barely more than a dozen pages, is of great importance and demands particular attention from the professors in our seminaries. Many of our students enter upon the practical duties of the sacred ministry with no other preparation but a theoretical knowledge of the principles, facts and laws on the subject. When they come to act or to decide a case they are bewildered with the multiplicity of these principles, and their applications, and often forget to ask the main question which must determine their judgment. This arises from a lack of systematic method or procedure in the practice of the pastoral cure. The field of inquiry covers two distinct topics, viz. the existence of impediments which render the marriage act either null or illicit: and the requisites for a worthy and happy marriage, demanding a knowledge of its rights and obligations. Each of these two topics has its subordinate forms of expression, which must be mastered in general order by the young cleric before he steps into the seat of judge. He examines and corrects existing errors, he announces and instructs. All this is clearly laid down by our

author. Then in four succeeding sections he treats of the effects of marriage; of second marriages; of divorce; finally, of the ecclesiastical mode of procedure in trials concerning the validity of sponsalia and matrimonial contracts.

The letter-press is good although there are an unusual number of typographical errors. We hope to see this excellent work soon in its second edition.

OUR SEMINARIES. An Essay on Clerical Training. By Rev. John Talbot Smith, LL.D.,—New York: William H. Young & Co. 1896.

It is not easy to do justice to the writer of this book if we undertake to guage him by some things he says in its pages. He does not pretend to anything like a comprehensive knowledge of the subject which he discusses. He claims, indeed, "a good acquaintance with the condition of many seminaries" and this acquaintance, if we except "two important institutions" which he "has studied," is the result of his intercourse with seminarians and priests, some of whom have, as he tells us, been intelligent and conscientious observers.

All this is quite enough to enable a man of Dr. Smith's ability and evident earnestness of purpose, to ascertain and point out numerous deficiencies in our system of seminary-training, and to make suggestions for its improvement. The author emphasizes his determination to keep before the reader the practical ideal of the American priesthood, and there is nothing in his manner of writing which betrays the intemperate zeal of the self-constituted reformer.

Nevertheless, the well disposed reader will occasianally be forced to recognize a lack of that peculiarly conservative quality which characterizes the trend of a wise policy suggested for a practical purpose. Thus our estimate of Dr. Smith's judgment is lessened, and our sense of the limitations of his experience grows definite, when we meet with such statements (repeated in various fashions throughout the book) as that "our seminaries are but homes for hypochondriacs" or the seeming triviality that "really good butter never yet reached a seminarian's table" and that "the coffee and tea are always pure slop." These and like expressions used with some vigor, imply serious charges against responsible heads of institutions supported for the most part by the generous contributions of people who have confidence in the managers of our semi-

naries. If the insinuations be true in some cases, they are certainly not so in many others, and if one were to take results on a large basis we believe that our clergy, far from being hypochondriacs, are in truth the most good humored and joy-inspiring portion of what we may call the professional classes, not excluding the army and navy.

Dr. Smith makes an excellent division of his subject. He takes as a standard the priest as the representative of Christ, perfect in heart and mind and body. In his outline of the training which is to lead up to that perfection, Dr. Smith reminds us that the youth with whom we have to deal is American and meant to fit American conditions. This is well. As to the methods to be pursued for the obtaining of that self government, that external urbanity, that culture of mind and heart which distinguishes the true gentleman of the educated classes, we have ample opportunity for selecting our models. Father Smith suggests the West Point Military Academy as a pattern of training for our colleges which "exhausts the capacity of the student" and as a "practical, lofty, reasonable standard for the coming American seminary." No right minded man can fail to admire the perfect obedience, the manly sense of honor, and the thorough application to study and drill which is required and obtained at a military institution like West Point. We might use it as an argument for setting our faces relentlessly against the spirit of insubordination or of that arrogant criticism which sits in judgment on the merits of a superior's orders before executing them, a spirit which asserts itself occasionally in the seminary and which grows naturally in a land where the notion of liberty, true or false, is kept constantly before the young. But beyond this there are great voids in the military system of the West Point Military Academy, such as the brutality of hazing and the un-American spirit of discrimination on social grounds, which suggest that the gentlemanly sense is not so very much apart from that of the trained groom, having nothing in common with humanity of the Christian type. A system of discipline mental and spiritual such as is contained in the *ratio studiorum* of Aquaviva would carry us much farther and fulfill all the demands of external decorum made upon a priest by the most fastidious worldling. Hence, without wishing to weaken the lesson to be derived from the West Point discipline, we would be unwilling to adopt it as a standard, for the simple reason that we have an excellent standard of our own, tested and approved by the most varied experience. We have nothing to learn at this stage of our

history ; we have only to *do*, to carry out the spiritual training of the old masters, which is fundamental to all true progress. Without, therefore, wishing in the least point to advocate ignorance or neglect of new methods, we hold it a false policy to appeal forever to the modern spirit, as if the Church were the servant and not the originator and leader of the ever-repeated reform-movements of society to the end of time.

In respect to spiritual training, we believe that we shall never be able to dispense with the old methods of meditation ; they are founded on the constitution of the human mind, and on the assumption of a fallen nature. If anything, they are more necessary to the youth of this country than to the boys of a past generation and abroad. The maturity of views which characterizes the American youth is not to be confounded with either solidity of judgment or stability. It is often simply a readiness to attempt and to do, which arises out of a quick realization of circumstances, and lacks both principle and consistency. Disposition is not character, but the latter is the result of habits begotten by often-repeated acts, the motive of which is placed before the youth in systematic reflection. That is the object of daily meditation seasoned by a practical taste of self-denial and mortification. In the same way desultory reading, most of all that of newspapers, is a positive hindrance to the formation of a reflective mind and of the habits which are the outcome of its systematic exercise. Hence we would rather oppose the free circulation of this sort of literature in the seminary, which Dr. Smith suggests as a stimulus toward gaining knowledge. Experience verifies the fact that much reading of newspapers weakens the mind not only of the student but of the priest who is supposed to be much riper and more capable of utilizing the knowledge gained from such sources. Men who have fine minds and were good students in the seminary often lose in after years all taste for solid exercise of their mental faculties, simply because they yield to the inclination of satisfying their curiosity by the trashy reading of the daily press.

The idea that the improvement of society lies in the main in "being up to the times" rests to a great extent upon the exaggerated assumption that the world has changed so suddenly that the old truths are effete, and that the modern world requires a new pedagogy, a new spirituality, in short a new measure of truth and virtue. We believe that the conditions of society to-day, whatever changes a rapidly progressive development has brought about in

certain national directions, are not more opposed in principle to the old methods of teaching moral and intellectual truth, than were the conditions of Roman society at the time when a simple fisherman came to enlighten the Augustan wisdom by methods which, wholly out of date, proved themselves capable of absorbing the best elements of the old, and creating a new civilization which our "advanced" philosophy has not a whit improved. This we say, not because we undervalue modern achievements, but because we consider Dr. Smith's plea for the modern spirit exaggerated, and, as it were, the keynote to many impossible suggestions for reform.

Some of the old methods which he condemns lie at the very foundation of healthy spiritual growth, and as a matter of fact they are constantly adapting themselves to the new circumstances.

It would carry us too far to enter here into further details of the statements of Dr. Smith; but he has given us the opportunity to carry on future discussions of vital importance to our clergy and people. For the present we wish merely to record our general estimate of the book. A widely experienced, learned, and prudently progressive educator of our young clergy, whom we asked for an opinion on the subject, answered: It is evident the author has never been in the work. Many things seem possible to him which we can hardly hope for, especially in the degree he considers easily attainable. One of his greatest mistakes is to suppose in the average student a maturity of thought and depth of soul which is, alas! to be found among the chosen few. He has no conception, because he has no experience of the difficulty of combining a certain number of things admissible, it may be desirable in themselves, but which are attainable in the vast majority only in the shape of a compromise." Yet the book will stimulate thought among those whose interest it is to better the existing conditions and to attain that finely-equipped clergy which Dr. Smith pictures for us. He points out our Lord's life as the model, and refers to Father Coleridge as an exponent of that life. Here is what Father Coleridge says in one of his volumes on the Training of the Apostles (vol. v, pp. 146): "Men's minds must not be at once and violently turned to a new system. It must grow on them by degrees. They must first learn its spirit and principles, and when these have taken possession of them they will find no difficulty in adopting the external and detailed system which is the natural expression and application of that spirit and those principles." And again further on he shows the wisdom of "not forcing a part of a new system on men till the

whole can be introduced . . . before men are ready for it. These are general principles of divine prudence, and of human prudence also."

BOOKS AND READING. By Brother Azarias of the Brothers of the Christian Schools. Fifth Edition enlarged. New York: The Cathedral Library Association. 1896.

Desultory reading, even of good matter, injures the best mind, just as the healthy stomach may be corrupted by an indiscriminate use of choice foods. Hence lists of good books will not suffice the purpose of guiding us to the acquisition of useful knowledge. A well-regulated course of reading demands the adaptation of the reading matter "according to the various stages of one's mental development." This is essential to right study. Books containing methods and systems, books of science whence we obtain the laws and principles of any practice, make demands upon the common factors of memory and understanding only, but the books which form the character, which influence our moral views and the movement of our will, are of entirely different nature. Yet it is these latter which determine our efficiency in practical life, our daily happiness and our hope for the future. The man who knows how to guide us in a course of reading so as to allow some particular author to influence us in right measure and at the moment when we are duly susceptible of such influence, benefits us immeasurably more than does a teacher of Euclid's and Newton's scientific accuracy and depth. Nor is the literary man always capable of giving us the proper direction in reading for the purpose of rightly educating our mind and heart. There are books which are bad for one and good for another according as one possesses more or less of the quality which draws the good matter from a given substance and converts the evil into a moral lesson against the commission of sin. Hence the expert guide will discriminate. He will point out not only books, but also the temper with which we are to take up their reading, the system by which we assimilate the good and make the bad emphasize that good instead of marring it.

Such a guide was Brother Azarias. He was a man who, as Mr. Mooney points out in his introductory Memoir to the volume before us, had read much, thought much, and stored much intellectual wealth. He loved truth and longed to impart it to others by means of the refining influence of good literature. "Convinced that only

by familiarity with the thoughts of the greatest thinkers and artists can the intellectual elevation of American society be assured, he tried to acquaint many with the thought and art of the greatest writers of our own time and of the past."

Few individual services for the promotion of good literature have been rendered to Catholics in our day and country which deserve more genuine applause than the publication of these essays upon "Books and Reading" at the instigation of the Rev. Joseph H. McMahon, Director of the Cathedral Library Reading Circle of New York City.

Every paragraph is filled with safe directions and helpful suggestions as to the choice of books, the manner of reading, the wisdom of forgetting, the method of using to the best advantage what we read. Brother Azarias was by instinct and training a teacher or as Mr. Mooney aptly phrases it "a talented, capable, right-minded educator," an educator who is still living in his books. We candidly believe that if this little volume were introduced as a text-book in our schools and colleges, to be read and conned over in all the classes of English literature until every word be committed to memory, and every principle be assimilated into practical taste, it would effect a quick and most beneficial change in the mental attitude of our reading classes towards popular literature, and it would open new springs of production more pure, without being less lofty and refining, than those of our best classic English authors.

Let our young men and women in college and academy be made to realize, as Brother Azarias puts it before them, that there must be a purpose in their reading, and though that purpose be for the time only rest or amusement, it must be recreation in truth, that is to say, it must strengthen, broaden, and be helpful to the main object of our existence. They will find how to put method in their historical reading; how to read patiently with a view to writing for others; how to become original by means of observation in reading. Here we find grouped together the leading models for literary study, their strength and their shadows carefully marked, and all the paraphernalia which aid in their true appreciation separately placed before us.

The chapters on "How to Read Dante" and "The Motive of George Eliot's Novels" are additions of special merit and interest; whilst the biographical sketch of that gem of an educated woman, Kathleen O'Mara, and the chapter on "Mr. Augustine Birrell and Criticism" as well as "A Peep into Tennyson's workshop" represent various phases of literary work which aptly illustrate the

lessons given in the principal portion of the volume entitled "Books and Reading."

The edition is handsomely printed and the Cathedral Library Association makes a sufficient concession to the demand for moderate prices when it offers so excellent a book at fifty cents. Any student who means to have and use rightly a good reading library should begin by mastering this volume.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS. By Rev. Morgan M. Sheedy, first President of the Catholic Summer School of America, Author of "Christian Unity," &c.—Chicago: D. H. McBride & Co. 1896.

It is a fortunate outcome of the recent and still-glowing agitation in which labor and capital have become involved, that it should have awakened the intelligent activity of practical minds whose conclusions on the subject are based upon the solid foundation of natural and revealed truth. There is no other key to the actual and permanent solution of the so-called "labor problem" than that which is offered by the teaching of the Church of Christ. His coming on earth meant nothing else than to give to man a practical demonstration of that solution which was to hold good unto the end of time, and it is vain to ignore this fact or to look for any other way out of the difficulty.

Father Sheedy writes in excellent temper, although he closely touches delicate lines of demarcation between the right to hold and the right to acquire. He speaks from experience and that experience gives to his utterance occasionally a tone of indignant sympathy with the working classes, but all through there is a deeper vain of priestly desire to be helpful to the unfortunate masses without sanctioning either the excesses or the principles of a false socialism which seeks redress in rebellion against capital and rule. The socialism which the author advocates is Christian. The guide in the movement of Christian socialism must be, in the future as in the past, the Catholic Church. She may accept the help of those who are outside of her fold, of the same mind, though only in part with her, but there is no other power, no other light, that could supplant or equal her in attaining this end. Let "the Church," as Father Sheedy, following the direction of Leo XIII suggests, "that is bishops, priests and students of social science, set herself to educate

and direct the masses towards better social conditions, and thus aid in bringing about a peaceful solution of the social problem."

The volume forms one of the very handy books of the Summer School Library Series published by McBride & Co. and deserves to be widely circulated.

SOUVENIR OF THE SOLEMN BLESSING AND OPENING OF ST. JOSEPH'S SEMINARY of the City of New York, by the Most Rev. Michael A. Corrigan, D.D., Archbishop of New York, at Dunwoodie, Yonkers, N. Y.—The Cathedral Library Association. 1896.

This is a respectable brochure, containing an historical account of the development of St. Joseph's Seminary from its first foundation in 1833, with its different locations, to the eventual erection of the present magnificent structure on Valentine Hill. The numerous illustrations of buildings, and especially the interior arrangement of the present Seminary will prove not only interesting study to many who follow the trend of ecclesiastical education, but it will be helpful to clerics and architects engaged and interested in the erection of similar institutions. We shall have an opportunity to return to this topic in a "*History of American Ecclesiastical Seminaries*" which is being prepared for the pages of the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

KALENDARIUM MANUALE utriusque Ecclesiae Orientalis et Occidentalis. Academiis clericorum accomodatum, auspiciis Commissarii Apostolici auctius atque emendatius iterum edidit Nicholaus Nilles, S.J. Tom. I.—Oeniponte : Felicianus Rauch (K. Pustet). 1896.

For a number of years it has been absolutely impossible to obtain a copy of this first volume the original edition of which, published about sixteen years ago, was quickly exhausted after the second volume had appeared. Since that time the importance of the work has grown far beyond the anticipation of author or publisher, and the demand for a complete copy of the book has brought about a new issue of the first part which had become extremely scarce in the book market.

The value of the work—to put it in a nut-shell—consists in this principally, that it gives us a complete and most accurate insight into the condition and mutual relation of the Eastern and Western

liturgies. In this respect the work is simply perfect. If we remember that the liturgy of the Oriental churches is intimately bound up with all the doctrinal, historical and social habits and prejudices of the faithful whom the Roman pontiff is commissioned to lead in unity of doctrine and the bond of brotherly charity, we recognize at once the vast importance of a thorough knowledge of this element in bringing about that permanent harmony of action by which the schismatic bodies also will be likely to be brought back to the bosom of the Mother church.

This importance is increased in our own case. If to Americans in general has been assigned the noble mission of harmonizing unto mutually helpful and peaceful activity the various races of God's earth—then our clergy have assigned them in this field a special responsibility. The vast number of well-disposed immigrants from the East seek here an opportunity where, like many of our own kindred, they may found for themselves, in honest thrift, a home secure from oppression, and with prospect of improving the physical, mental and moral conditions of their posterity. This is a God-given privilege. None can be more helpful to them in securing it than the Catholic priest—I say the Catholic priest who by reason of his title is justly above all national and sectional lines. The Catholic from Hungary, Sicily, Malta, Armenia and the farther East, has not always within reach of his needs temporal and spiritual, a pastor whose familiar voice can call him by his own name. But he knows that religion does not consist in words, that however sweet his native accent may sound in his ear it is not essential to his receiving the gifts and graces of God through legitimate channels of another kind than that to which he had been accustomed. When we see a man falling within our reach we ask no questions about his country but stretch out our hand to lift him. When we find a child starving we do not waste time to find out its parentage ere we offer him of our own bread. So every priest is bound to aid these pilgrims in a strange land as best he can by the breaking of bread, by the powerful teaching of active charity. If all other voices be dumb this one will speak with convincing force, for "tongues may cease and knowledge shall be destroyed—charity abideth, kind, patient, not seeking its own," and hence Catholic in the widest sense of the word.

But to do this effectually, to arouse our own hearts to interest in behalf of the stranger from the East, we must understand his ways, his traditional peculiarities. If you reach out a pole to a man

struggling with the waves and he does not understand the act but thinks that you mean to strike him, he will not meet your proffered help but repel it. To understand the Eastern people we must become familiar with their ways by study of their habits of devotions, their doctrinal views of essential truths, their privileges and peculiarities of ecclesiastical discipline. All this is gained from a comparison of the Greek and Latin rites as explained in the work before us.

There is another advantage in this study besides that of enabling our charity to be practical and truly Catholic. It broadens the mind. We have suffered much in the quick growth of Catholic influence from narrow views slavishly adhered to and without sufficient reason, which local tradition had impressed on the individual mind. A child will carry the most absurd superstition far into mature life, because it is supported by the authority of parent or teacher. Thus it happens that we measure the practices, the convictions and motives of others differing from our own by the narrow standard of preconceived notions and limited knowledge. A married or bearded priest is taken as wanting in some essential of the sacred order by those who know only celibates and shaven clerics; and so it is in regard to other things which are condemned because misapprehended through ignorance, for which there is no excuse among educated men.

Finally, a familiarity with the ritual observances of the Eastern Catholics will enable us to foster union, union, if not of rite, certainly of sentiment and of zeal for the propagation of the one holy Catholic faith. For the several Churches of the East proclaim one and the same faith, and five or six nationalities unite in the fundamental spirit of their devotions. Thus the Ordo printed in Aleppo in the Arabian tongue is used by the Latins, the Melchites, the Armenians, Syrians and Maronites. In the Taqvîm Beryti translated into Arabian the feasts of the Chaldees are added, so that it serves as the official Kalendar for six nationalities.

> Let Whig and Tory stir their blood;
> —There must be stormy weather—
> But for some true result of good
> All parties work together.
>
> (*Tennyson—Will Waterpr. Lyr. Monolog.*)

P. Nilles, with a diligence and rare exactness of erudition which can only be measured by the broad scope of his enterprise, has arranged a sort of concordance of the various Oriental Kalendaria

compared with the Roman. This comparison is illustrated by historical and hagiographical notes which have also in most cases a strictly critical value. Thus many obscure terms and devotional forms of the Eastern Church and their dogmatical sense become clear. In fact separate chapters are devoted to this portion alone, such as the one entitled: *De terminis technicis librorum liturgicorum ecclesiae orientalis*, and a previous one, *De usu dogmatico testimoniorum ex libris liturgicis ecclesiae orientalis desumptorum.*

Thus the earnest student is enabled to become familiar with the Syriac, Greek, Slavic, Roumanian, Arabic and other liturgies. The explanation of the historic position of the Eastern Church in Hungary opens to his mind the understanding of the tangled relations of Catholics of Greek and Armenian rite who come to this country from the south and east of Europe and the Asian borderland. We learn something of the ways in which the slavic language came to be used in churches of the Latin rite and how the two are often mxied in the same service. The illustrious Archbishop of Vhrbosnia, who fully grasps the significance of this work at the present moment, speaks of it in terms that can hardly be exaggerated. After referring to the desire of Leo XIII. to unite the East and West into the one household of the apostolic faith, he points out how neccessary it is in order to bring about such a union, that the different national elements should know and understand each other —"*ut alter alterius ritum et res omnes, quae eo spectant, dies festos, jejunia, caeremonias omneque pietatis genus, diligenter addiscat, benevole interpretetur, ex aequo aestimet, meritoque honore prosequatur.* Deinde vero necessarium esse judicamus * * variae discrepantes opiniones dilucide explicentur ex textibus liturgicis et ex libris Sanctorum ipsius orientalis ecclesiae: qui ut caeteris solent esse accessu faciliores, sic et christianis orientalibus apertiores sunt ad intelligendum atque inde ad vulgarem popularemque sensum prae aliis accomodati."

"Now such a work," says the illustrious Apostolic Commissary to whom the labor of devising means by which to promote the above mentioned union had been especially entrusted by the Holy Father, "such a work has been prepared for the use of our young clergy by R. P. Nilles, professor at Innsbruck. These two volumes have been considered so excellently adapted to the said purpose that they have received, as is well known, the unanimous and most flattering commendation of the learned men who are judges representing many bishops of different nationalities." In fact it was through Arch-

bishop Stadler's exertions mainly that this first volume has been reprinted, for the expense of getting up a work in which so many different languages are represented, by their particular character of type, is necessarily great. The Archbishop thus concludes his encylical letter to the clergy under his commissariate: "It is not for us to increase the merited fame which this work everywhere enjoys among the learned of every class, but we would earnestly recommend the assiduous study of it to the clergy who live in contact with Christians of various rites, so that they might attain a correct knowledge of the practices of the Eastern Christians, *and make use of this knowledge* as opportunity affords, for the purpose of fostering sacred union."

The first volume is limited to a discusion of the *immovable* feasts whilst the second volume, of which a new edition is likewise in press, treats of the movable feasts, There is another part (embracing two volumes of altogether over a thousand pages) which is a sort of supplement to the *Kalendarium* and treats historically and in detail what might be called the dogmatic position of the Greek clergy toward the Roman. It deals with the question of union of the churches, particularly the Roumenian and Servian branches, and opens up countless sources of information regarding a question which is not only dominant now, but likely to ocupy the public mind in various ways for a long time to come.

THE YORKE-WENDTE CONTROVERSY. Letters on the Papal Primacy and the Relations of Church and State. By Rev. Chas. W. Wendte, D.D. and Rev. Peter C. Yorke.—San Francisco: Monitor Publishing Co. 1896.

This is one of the cleverest products of modern religious polemics which we have seen. It is clear and explicit in its statements of Catholic Doctrine and of these historical facts which usually furnish Protestant opponents with material for misrepresenting the Catholic Church. Through all the discussion there runs, on Father Yorke's part, a vein of humor which must have proved very trying to the Unitarian minister who undertook to enlighten his A. P. A. neighbors on the subject of Popish ambition and Romish disloyalty. We fancy that many a pastor who has to defend himself and his religion against the snarls and lies of neighbors who hate the Church without knowing it, will find in this collection of letters enough weapons ready to hand with which to vindicate the truth in the eyes of all right-minded citizens. Father Yorke ought to write more, or give us more of what he writes.